

John Carroll University

From the Selected Works of Jean Feerick

2016

The Imperial Graft: Horticulture,
Hybridity, and the Art of Mingling
Races in Henry V and Cymbeline

Dr. Jean E. Feerick, *John Carroll University*



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons CC_BY-NC-ND International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



Available at: <https://works.bepress.com/jean-feerick/2/>

CHAPTER 12

THE IMPERIAL GRAFT

*horticulture, hybridity, and the art of
mingling races in Henry V and Cymbeline*

JEAN E. FEERICK

And meet it is we should believe, that the Britans and Romans in so many ages
by a blessed and joyfull mutuall ingraffing, as it were, have growen into one stock
and nation.

Camden, *Britain*¹

GREENING THE RENAISSANCE BODY

IN response to the invitation to transmit knowledge of the early modern body to support readings of Shakespeare, I offer instead two stalks of greenery. Call it an Ovidian sleight of hand: in this essay I will metamorphosize human flesh into its green counterparts of roots, branches, trunk, bark, sap, and fruit. Though artful and possibly clever, some will view such a move as suspect, guilty of foreclosing interpretation in the same way that Ovid's Daphne surrenders her voice when she transforms from fleeing maiden to laurel tree. Scholars with an interest in retrieving histories of the body may see such a move as failing to respond to the needs of our postmodern, postcolonial moment, which demand tough interpretive tools to unpack our inheritance of a body violently riddled with markers of sex, gender, race, nation, and class. We come here in search of histories of the *human* body, eager to write back to Renaissance writers and their celebration of the white, heterosexual (English) man.

¹ William Camden, *Britain, or A chorographicall description of the most flourishing kingdoms, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adioyning, out of the depth of antiquitie*, trans. Philemon Holland (London, 1610), 88.

In translating the topic of 'embodiment' in such a way, however, we reveal ourselves to be 'modern' subjects. Lingering beneath our desire to illuminate Renaissance constructions of the *human* body may very well be an assumption that the human is ontologically distinct from other embodied life forms, a modern way of organizing relations among living beings. Renaissance writers, by contrast, insist on connections and overlaps between all life forms, perceiving the human body as materially and symbolically continuous with the surrounding world.² When we downplay the force such homologies carry for early modernity, we inadvertently limit the archive that shapes our inquiry and the kinds of interpretations available to us. I seek to avoid this predicament by tapping an atypical archive, accessing a history of embodiment refracted through the prism of botanical forms. Massive changes to the nature–culture continuum have all but blocked our ability to seriously entertain such connections, but early modern writers constantly deploy a green logic, culled from botany and its sister-science horticulture, to pose and respond to questions, concerns, and tensions that riddled the social sphere.³ In such a world the practices conducted in one domain travel promiscuously across the fleshy divide that appears (to us) to hold them apart. I excavate the early modern habit of perceiving similitude between plant and person in order to demonstrate the extent to which the horticultural art of grafting provided Shakespeare with a powerful tool for theorizing human difference in his plays.

Given the flurry of recent publications seeking to uncover Shakespeare's 'green' sensibilities, it perhaps hardly needs stating that Shakespeare, like his contemporaries, used plant life as a constant touchstone to explore issues of breeding and reproduction, as well as configurations of gender, sexuality, race, rank, and nation.⁴ Grafting, in particular, posed questions relevant to such categories of identity by testing the limits of a plant's 'nature' when it was 'coupled' with another to effect variations in colour, taste, and frequency of fruit production. Important work on grafting has already emphasized the sexual and genealogical dimensions of this art's use, tracing how the graft could organize, regulate, and even expand social, sexual, and familial identities.⁵ As a practice predicated on the

² On the correspondences between the cosmological world and the humoral body, see Gail Kern Paster, *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004). For the porous species boundary in the Renaissance, see Jean Feerick and Vin Nardizzi, eds, *The Indistinct Human in Renaissance Literature* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

³ The terms *botany* and *horticulture* gained currency in the mid to late seventeenth century. In the preceding century *husbandry* was the rubric under which practices such as 'the Art of Planting, Grafting and Gardening' fell, along with household management; see Gervase Markham, *The English Husbandman* (London, 1613), chapter title for Pt 2, Bk 1. Because I focus on planting and grafting, I use the terms *botany* and *horticulture* for the sake of clarity.

⁴ Recent criticism on Shakespeare and ecology includes: Lynne Bruckner and Dan Brayton, eds, *Ecocritical Shakespeare* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011); Forum on 'Shakespeare and Ecology', ed. Garrett Sullivan and Julian Yates, *Shakespeare Studies* (2011): 23–113; Jennifer Munroe and Rebecca Laroche, eds, *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); and Vin Nardizzi, *Wooden Os: Shakespeare's Theatres and England's Trees* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013).

⁵ For recent work on grafting and Renaissance literature, see especially Rebecca Bushnell, *Green Desire: Imagining Early Modern English Gardens* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003); Vin Nardizzi, 'Shakespeare's Penknife: Grafting and Seedless Generation in the Procreation Sonnets', *Renaissance and Reformation* 32:1 (2009), 83–106; Vin Nardizzi, 'Grafted to Falstaff and Compounded with Catherine: Mingling Hal in the Second Tetralogy', in *Queer Renaissance Historiography: Backward Gaze*, ed. Vin Nardizzi, Stephen Guy-Bray, and Will Stockton (Burlington, VT: Ashgate,

assumption that the commixture of plants of different origins, colours, and fruits could enhance strength, beauty, and profit, grafting also encodes crucial assumptions about race, nation, and 'kind' for this period that warrant unpacking. At the very least, celebrations by Renaissance writers of the wondrous effects achieved by fusing 'alien' plants suggest that early modern culture had access to a more receptive framing of cross-kind exchange than our histories of the period have acknowledged.

To date, critics of race have seen principles of 'purity' as governing how early modern English writers conceptualized the concept of race, which has been connected to concepts as diverse as skin colour, geo-humoralism, rhetoric, bloodline, and religious difference.⁶ Real or imagined excursions across racial and ethnic thresholds in the period have been understood as evincing overwhelming anxieties about the potential degradation of such principles.⁷ And yet many of our most basic metaphors for understanding race mixture are borrowed from the nineteenth century and its quite distinct race theories, as evidenced by a tendency among critics to apply a much later discourse of miscegenation to early modern materials.⁸ Close attention to the metaphors early modern writers used to convey the effects of mixing 'kinds'—cultural, linguistic, and physical—suggests a broader range of possibilities for the period. Grafting was one discursive matrix that Renaissance writers drew on for the rich, subtle, and nuanced vocabulary it provided in describing the benefits of conjoining unlike bodies. Though a botanical craft, grafting's resonance extended beyond the plant world, emblemizing the utopian aspirations underpinning all human

2009), 149–69; Miranda Wilson, 'Bastard Grafts, Crafted Fruits: Shakespeare's Planted Families', in *The Indistinct Human*, ed. Feerick and Nardizzi, 103–17; and Erin Ellerbeck, "'A Bett'ring of Nature": Grafting and Embryonic Development in *The Duchess of Malfi*', in Feerick and Nardizzi, 85–99.

⁶ For a sampling of approaches to early modern race, see: for an emphasis on skin colour, Kim F. Hall, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995); on geo-humoralism, Mary Floyd-Wilson, *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); on rhetoric, Ian Smith, *Race and Rhetoric in the Renaissance: Barbarian Errors* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); on bloodline, Jean Feerick, *Strangers in Blood: Relocating Race in the Renaissance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010); on religious difference, Jane Degenhardt, *Islamic Conversion and Christian Resistance on the Early Modern Stage* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010).

⁷ In his field-defining book *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), Stephen Greenblatt established the coordinates of this approach in arguing that England's national identity emerged 'in relation to something perceived as alien, strange or hostile' (9). For the view that Englishness emerged through notions of similitude and approximation, see Marjorie Rubright, *Doppelgänger Dilemmas: Anglo-Dutch Relations in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014). See also Wolfram Schmidgen, *Exquisite Mixture: The Virtues of Impurity in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

⁸ The term *miscegenation* was first coined in an 'anonymously published hoax pamphlet circulated in 1863' (see *OED*, *miscegenation*, etymology). For discussions of *miscegenation* in the Renaissance, see Karen Newman, *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), esp. 74 and 75; Kim Hall, 'Guess Who's Coming to Dinner? Colonization and Miscegenation in *The Merchant of Venice*', *Renaissance Drama* 23 (1992), 87–111; and Margo Hendricks, 'Race: A Renaissance Category?' in *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, vol. 2, ed. Michael Hattaway (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2010). Lara Bovilsky explores the historical dimensions of the term in *Barbarous Play: Race on the English Renaissance Stage* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), esp. 43–4.

acts of creation. Just as the poet's imagination strove to body 'forth / The forms of things unknown', so the grafter pushed nature beyond its customary patterns.⁹ The grafter's skill in conjoining plants anew enacted on the physical world the very kinds of transformations Renaissance poets saw themselves as effecting by using metaphor, a trope that Puttenham described as 'a kinde of wresting of a single word from his owne rightfull signification, to another not so naturall, but yet of some affinitie or coueniencie with it'.¹⁰ In this locution, where signs and meanings are invested with a kind of genealogical bond, the poet is imagined as an agent of mixture, actively promoting a more liberal conjunction between terms with some degree of 'affinitie'. Similarly, grafting prodded nature in new directions by combining plants that were 'proximate' but not quite 'kin', creating offspring that exhibited greater strength, delicacy, and appeal in the process. Given the affinities between the poet's and grafter's craft, it is not surprising to find an artist like Shakespeare drawing on grafting's lexicon to contemplate the implications of cultural and physical difference among people.

Certainly, a play like *The Winter's Tale* is evidence of a dramatist thinking with this trope to access the complex cultural codes governing human reproduction. The famous exchange between Polixenes and Perdita in Act 4, scene 4 in which they debate the merits of intervening in plant reproduction is often taken to be the *locus classicus* for discussions of Shakespeare's treatment of grafting. But the poet's imaginative recourse to this trope is far more extensive across the corpus than the emphasis on this pastoral set piece has led us to believe, and I take as my focus a set of plays not commonly associated with grafting, reading *Henry V* alongside *Cymbeline*. Although not usually read together, since genre and period hold them apart, both plays represent a moment when an imperial formation—English or Roman—was in progress, and both approach the mechanisms of conquest and expansion through the motif of grafting. Theories of grafting as they were applied to human groups suggested that a colonizer could best be served not by retaining a rigid separation from the colonized population but by strategically combining with that group to form a stronger and more resilient racial hybrid. Guided by this logic, Shakespeare's plays explore how England's imperial prospects improve when rigid boundaries of race and rank give way to principles of mixture and hybridity. If the kind of hybridity these plays sanction falls short of being egalitarian, since one term of the grafted union is held to be superior to the other, neither are the hierarchies that it enforces precisely those entailed by later discourses of miscegenation which propound that mixture of any kind distorts, disrupts, and degrades its participants. In Shakespeare's plays, by contrast, the racial mingling achieved by grafting populations divided by nation, culture, and rank is embraced as a feature that has long-defined England, and the condition of being grafted together with 'foreign' kinds—whether construed as Roman or British, Irish, Welsh, or Scottish—is revealed to be a prerequisite of empire. By utilizing a theory of benign mixture, both plays stage the grafted polity as a union consummately to be desired.

⁹ William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer's Night Dream*, 5.1.14–15. All quotations of Shakespeare's plays and poems are from Stephen Greenblatt et al., eds, *The Norton Shakespeare* (London and New York: W.W. Norton, 1997). Further citations will appear parenthetically in the text with reference to act, scene, and line number. For the connections between grafting and poetry, see Bushnell, *Green Desire*, esp. ch. 3.

¹⁰ George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London, 1589), 189.

GRAFTING'S 'REFORMED' MIXTURES

For Renaissance writers, people and plants bore a striking resemblance, expressing a similar morphology and physiology and overlapping reproductive patterns. To their eyes, the sap travelling beneath the protective layer of bark was analogous to the flow of human blood, its leaves evocative of human hair, and its knobs of human eyes. One writer even attributed to plants the kind of intentionality understood as present in animate beings, describing them as 'breeding creatures' that exhibit a tendency to bear fruit 'perfectedly to their own kind'.¹¹ The vocabulary of 'kind' that writers frequently use to describe plants reveals, moreover, a tendency to see them as part of complex kinship networks and to enlist this domain for exploring human genealogical relations. Experiments in the garden, if not in the social realm, were encouraged, since it was a Christian truism that post-lapsarian nature required stewardship to achieve its full potential.¹² As William Lawson put it, 'there is a profitable end, and vse of euery tree, from which if it decline (though by nature) yet man by art may (nay must) correct it'.¹³ Gervase Markham reiterated the necessity of husbandry at large, urging 'it is most necessary for keeping the earth in order, which else would grow wilde, and like a wilderness . . . nothing remaining but a Chaos of confusednesse'.¹⁴ This ability to be shaped was one of the plant world's strongest attractions for Renaissance writers, who speculated that changes to form, taste, colour, texture, and reproductive output in plant bodies might resonate in analogous ways for human populations.

Grafting animated these questions with particular force, since it enabled the gardener to blend at least two plants—a stock and scion—to effect 'reform', 'betterment', or 'amelioration' to one, if not both plants.¹⁵ In his letter to the reader, Leonard Mascall described grafting as the 'skill to make the good fruites mo, / And ill fruites to *amend*', while Lawson defined it as 'The *reforming* of the fruit of one tree with the fruit of another'.¹⁶ The conjunction performed by grafting allowed the strength of a stock plant, often referred to as the 'wild' or 'savage' partner for the fact that it did not naturally yield desirable fruit, to be available to serve the beauty and fruit-bearing potential of the prized scion. Grafting was understood to transmit benefits to the 'wild stock', as well, since it enabled the hardier plant to funnel its powerful sap towards productive ends, becoming host to any number of fruits simultaneously. Because the union allowed the sap of the one plant to permeate the slip of the other, it was a conjunction of a very intimate kind. As Lawson saw it, 'the

¹¹ William Lawson, *A New Orchard and Garden or The best way for planting, grafting, and to make any ground good for a rich Orchard* . . . (London, 1631), 23. Further quotations will appear in the text.

¹² For the Christian emphasis on the natural world as fallen, see Keith Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England, 1500–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

¹³ Lawson, *A New Orchard*, 44.

¹⁴ See Gervase Markham, *The English Husbandman*, sig. A3^v.

¹⁵ For a reading of the grafter's tool as a trope for the poet's pen, see Miranda Wilson and Vin Nardizzi, 'The Secrets of Grafting in Wroth's *Urania*', in *Ecofeminist Approaches*, ed. Munroe and Laroche, 175–94.

¹⁶ Leonard Mascall, *A Booke of the Arte and maner how to Plant and Graffe all sorts of Trees, how to sette Stones & sow Pepins, to make wild trees to graffe on, as also remedies & medicines* . . . (London, 1590), 'The Booke to the Reader', emphasis added; Lawson, *A New Orchard*, 33, emphasis added.

sape is the life of the tree, as the bloud is to mans body'.¹⁷ By 'intermingling' the saps of two or more plants, then, the gardener was, in effect, blending their 'bloodlines', performing a kind of exogamous combination, a sexually charged exchange of physical nature.¹⁸ Mascall insisted that co-sanguinity between the two plants be complete: 'Above all things ye must consider the meeting of the two sappes, betwixt the graffe and the wilde stocke ... for ye shall understande, if they doe not ioyne, and the one delight with the other ... they shall never take together.'¹⁹ By overseeing an event joining two plants in 'delight' for increase, gardeners could be construed as would-be 'panders' actively controlling the sexual couplings of plants.²⁰ The language they used to frame their art seemed to highlight these sexual valences, describing grafting through a lexicon of breeding and reproduction as an act that 'compounds', 'conjoins', 'intermingles', and 'mixes' two or more disparate bodies.²¹

But grafting also intersected in compelling ways with the period's discourses of difference surrounding race, nation, and kind, since it strove to conjoin two plants bearing some degree of *unlikeness*. Bushnell has demonstrated this point by noting the imprint of social hierarchies—the proliferation of references to 'noble' and 'base' plants—in the literature on grafting.²² But the period's horticultural discourse was infused as well with the language of ethnic and racial difference since writers spoke of 'native slips' and 'foreign seeds', 'strange stalke[s]' and 'strange shoots', using a rather crude lexicon of geographical and cultural difference to describe them.²³ Indeed the tracts commonly conflate principles of difference we now conceive as distinct by referring to lesser plants interchangeably in a language of degraded social location—as 'base' stock—as well as racial difference—as 'savage' plants—expressing the coordinates of an early modern racial imaginary in which social station and cultural difference served as mutually reinforcing axes of alterity. Grafters discovered that there were limits to how much difference two grafted plants could tolerate, and those plants sharing a degree of proximity or similarity—an apple and a pear tree, for instance—witnessed the greatest success in producing hybrids that would thrive.

Since early modern writers perceived the plant world to be charged with hierarchies resembling those defining society, many sought to identify the patterns governing the

¹⁷ Lawson, *A New Orchard*, 9.

¹⁸ For the language of 'intermingling', see Della Porta's *Natural Magick*, which claims that husbandry 'shows how to intermingle sundry kinds of plants and how to produce new kinds' (qtd in Bushnell, *Green Desire*, 142).

¹⁹ Leonard Mascall, *A Booke of the Arte and maner*, 27.

²⁰ Wilson draws out the sexual overtones in many early modern descriptions of grafting, as well as the view of the grafter as a third party facilitating sexual conjunction. See 'Bastard Grafts, Crafted Fruits', in *The Indistinct Human*, ed. Feerick and Nardizzi, 111.

²¹ For grafting's 'conjugal' and sexual resonances, see Nardizzi, 'Grafted to Falstaff', in *Queer Renaissance Historiography*, ed. Guy-Bray, Nardizzi, and Stockton, 150–1; and Nardizzi, 'Shakespeare's Penknife', in *Renaissance and Reformation*. If grafting attached a sexual valence to vegetation, Marjorie Swann has demonstrated the extent to which plants were otherwise seen as a 'sex-free zone' in this era prior to the discovery of botanical sexuality (140); see 'Vegetable Love: Botany and Sexuality in Seventeenth-Century England', in *The Indistinct Human*, ed. Feerick and Nardizzi, 139–58.

²² As quoted in Bushnell, *Green Desire*, 149.

²³ These phrases are scattered throughout the horticultural manuals. For 'strange stalke' and 'strange shoots', see George Pettie, *A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure* (as quoted in Wilson, 'Bastard Grafts', in *The Indistinct Human*, ed. Feerick and Nardizzi, 104) and John Baptista Della Porta, *Natural Magick* (London, 1658), 64.

exchange of attributes between lesser stock and elite scion, with some concerned that the sap-blood of the former not overpower the nature of the latter. Mascall, for one, resists the idea that a radical intermingling of attributes occurs during grafting, reasoning, 'although the stocke and the grafte be of contrarie natures: yet notwithstanding neither the graffe nor Scutchin, shall take any part of the wild stock so grafted'.²⁴ His words guard against the fear of contaminating contact with the 'wild stock', even as he emphasizes the benefits the scion will derive from precisely such contact by observing that the more vigorous sap of the 'wild stock' will support fruit 'great' in quality and quantity. Markham, by contrast, embraces a theory of deep alteration of both parties, noting that the very kernel of the scion will be transformed, transmitting such alterations to future offspring.²⁵

Attentive to the subtle modulations of difference and hybridity that grafting catalysed, Shakespeare appropriated this trope to construct an imperial imaginary in which the mixture of two or more similar but unlike peoples—whether divided by race, nation, or social rank—denotes less an act of corruption than one providing inherent benefits to England and Britain, past and present. While it might seem reasonable to trace such a theory of benign mixture to the end of Shakespeare's career, when the mixed mode of tragicomedy became fashionable, I suggest it is equally present in drama of the late Elizabethan period, when Shakespeare's second tetralogy was performed. Indeed, the imprint of this thinking is evident as early as the first tetralogy, albeit in negated form, since these plays portray an England trapped in a cycle of self-violence, hijacked by an aristocracy at war with itself. These early plays fixate on a nation too rigidly enclosed around its elite members, a toxic environment rendered through tropes of self-cannibalism, festering bodies, and graphic scenes of physical mutilation. Shakespeare's subsequent attempts to stage the nation's past in plays that contemplate the effects of dispensing with rigid boundaries—political, physical, and linguistic—intimate that success as an imperial power requires an opening out onto the world, as well as a willingness to hybridize native forms. Far from associating such exchanges with degradation, these later plays intimate that the transgression of principles of purity through strategic acts of grafting is the key to England's imperial future.

MINGLE-MANGLE ENGLAND

On the eve of Agincourt, the Dauphin in dialogue with his French peers offers a view of the English soldiers that reads as a textbook explication of the art of grafting. Encountering an aggressive English force sweeping across France, he wonders how they have become so powerful and turns to grafting to contemplate the complex genealogical patterns they embody: 'Shall a few sprays of us, ... Our scions, put in wild and savage stock, / Spirit up so suddenly into the clouds / And over-look their grafters?' (3.5.5–9). Figuring an earlier English people as the 'wild and savage stock' forcibly grafted onto by the elite scion of his Norman forefathers, he is stunned that the conjunction has produced such a 'spirit[ed]' people. And yet, if the Dauphin presents Norman-English mettle as a kind of paradox,

²⁴ Leonard Mascall, "To The Reader", 19.

²⁵ Gervase Markham, *The English Husbandman*, sig. A3^v, 41.

horticultural manuals regularly claimed that the fruit of a grafted tree would be stronger and more productive than that generated by either original plant. In the case of the English of Shakespeare's play, they are a grafter's dream, having grown into a superior version of the already powerful Norman scions of an earlier era. Of course, the French deny what their eyes attest when Bourbon disparagingly refers to the advancing troops as 'Normans, but bastard Normans, Norman bastards!' (3.5.10). But Shakespeare's play writes back to these elite Normans, staging their spectacular defeat by this small, ragged band of brothers, who do indeed come to 'over-look their grafters'. The dissonance between the French predictions and the war's outcome suggests the play roundly rejects their equation of weakness with being mingled.

Critics have long debated the imperial dynamics of this play, particularly in the context of arguments about its role in the internal colonization of the British Isles and the Elizabethan conquest of Ireland.²⁶ An early wave of New Historicist critics read the play as staging the assimilation and erasure of the peoples of the Celtic 'periphery' into an English 'core', while a second wave, guided by post-structuralism, emphasized how the play's marginalized peoples eluded the centre's hegemonic tug through a kind of linguistic mimicry.²⁷ Both camps tended to see the play as orchestrating a relation between opposed terms, between a core and its periphery, or English and non-English.²⁸ I propose yet another way to understand the play's imperial work, one that takes seriously grafting's emphasis on the dynamic exchange of attributes between two conjoined kinds. For despite the appeals to pure genealogies that many of the play's characters assert, the play intimates that it is the condition of all nations to be racial and linguistic composites. Indeed, before we are introduced to the French aristocracy, the play's apologists for purity of blood, Canterbury has already exposed their originary narratives—especially the Sallic Law—as fabricated and suspect, revealing a nation defined less by crisp geographic and somatic boundaries than by permissive exchanges. If Henry and his men appear to these French lords as mere mongrels—'the emptying of our fathers' luxury' (3.5.6)—they may as well be speaking of themselves, since we have already heard of a time when their forefathers settled in the 'land Sallic', trafficking with 'German women' known for their 'dishonest manners' (1.2.44, 48–9).

²⁶ For the play's relation to British imperialism, see Willy Maley, *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Christopher Highley, *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); David Baker, *Between Nations: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marvell and the Question of Britain* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997); and Stephen O'Neill, *Staging Ireland: Representations in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007).

²⁷ The first camp is best exemplified by Stephen Greenblatt, 'Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and its Subversion, *Henry IV* and *Henry V*', in *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 18–47. The second camp is best exemplified by Highley, *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland*; Baker, *Between Nations*; and Andrew Murphy, 'But the Irish Sea betwixt Us': *Ireland, Colonialism, and Renaissance Literature* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999).

²⁸ The new British history views the histories of Scottish, Welsh, English, and Irish as complexly interrelated and urges a distrust of oversimplified identity categories; see Maley, 'The Irish Text and Subtext of Shakespeare's English Histories', in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works: Volume II: The Histories*, ed. Richard Dutton (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 94–124, esp. 115.

And yet what distinguishes the two nations at war in this play is that England appears to embrace its composite identity, whereas France disavows its mingled past. Indeed, although Canterbury and Ely go to great lengths in the opening scenes to establish a lineal claim to the French throne for Henry, the play also radically undercuts such assertions—for Henry as for the French—by exposing them as self-interested and riddled with half-truths and glaring omissions. Indeed the proliferation of ‘originals’ who serve as pattern to Henry—whether Edward III, the Black Prince, Henry IV, Richard II, or Alexander ‘the Pig’—itself interrogates the notion of replication through genealogical reproduction. If the prince can be said to resemble each of these antecedents, then the extent to which he can claim strict lineal derivation from any one of them—especially his father—becomes fraught.²⁹ More often than not, it is the French who position Henry on a genealogical continuum, as ‘a stem / Of that victorious stock’ (2.4.62–3), viewing him as the reproductive issue and living repository of his aggressive forbears. Against lineal purity as the measure of Henry and by extension the nation’s value, the play looks to horticultural principles of cultivation—and its hybrid productions—to define them both.

Notably, Henry’s past is characterized by an amazing act of self-husbandry, suggesting that his kingly identity is as much a product of cultivation as of genealogical inheritance. The bishops narrate this history in addressing the stunning transformation he has made at the moment of his father’s death. Appealing to the gardener’s craft, they observe how the young, seemingly wayward Henry actually benefitted from contact with the tavern crowd, whom Hal, in an earlier play, had described in deprecating terms as the ‘base contagious clouds’ and ‘foul and ugly mists’ which only did ‘seem’ to touch him, the royal sun (1 *Henry IV*, 1.2.176, 180, 181). The bishops of the later play imagine a more dynamic relationship between these terms, one in which Hal’s decision to be ‘Neighbour’d by fruit of baser quality’ has facilitated his ability to ‘thrive and ripen best’ (1.1.62–3). This term ‘neighbour’d’, as Lisa Hopkins has argued, is a constant touchstone in this play, appearing with unusual frequency and suggesting a dynamic proximity between unlike entities—base and cultured—which bears strong connections to the practice of grafting.³⁰ Whereas the graft requires an act of forceful coupling or penetration of plant bodies, ‘neighbour’d’ plants exchange qualities and benefits through proximity, a ‘softer’ form of mingling. In the estimation of the bishops, the act of ‘neighbouring’ plants among those of a different kind—positioning the strawberry beneath the nettle or delicate roots beneath ordure (2.4.39)—imparts benefits to the elite term by protecting it with cover, expediting its time to fruit, and enhancing the fruit’s flavour, all the while extracting value from matter otherwise deemed mere detritus—the ordure or stinging nettles.

If Henry’s decision to attach himself to his tavern ‘neighbours’ spells good self-husbandry in the past, the play defines such acts of proximity—which orchestrate the conjunction and association of low and high forms, savage and delicate—as the key to England’s imperial success going forward. Harry, that is, will continue to mingle his words and gestures with those of his neighbours. Indeed, such a dynamic describes Henry’s relation

²⁹ See David Scott Kastan’s discussion of 1 *Henry IV* and 2 *Henry IV* as similarly deconstructing sovereignty in ‘“The King hath many marching in his Coats”, or, What did you do in the War, Daddy?’ in *Shakespeare After Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 117–34.

³⁰ See Lisa Hopkins, ‘Neighbourhood in *Henry V*’, in *Shakespeare and Ireland: History, Politics, Culture*, ed. Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1997), 9–26.

to the motley crew of British captains who populate this play. Critics have already made the case that Henry absorbs these British captains into his imperial machine, but I would suggest that these men also mark the king, in accord with the dynamic merger figured by the graft. Indeed, although Macmorris is often read as a fiery, savage, and undisciplined man who is inassimilable to English order, the few lines assigned him bespeak a remarkable focus on England's military effort, not least through his condemnation of soldiers like Fluellen who impede the siege by preferring to 'talk' (49) though there are 'works to be done' (52). Moreover, if critics have seen him as equivocal about his status as 'Irish', 'English', or 'British', depending upon how we position a figure who bears a hybridized Norman name and yet appears in the play's earliest speech prefixes as 'Irish',³¹ he yet positions himself in remarkably politically orthodox terms with reference to his 'father's soul' (3.3.33), 'the King and the dukes' (47–8), and 'Chrish law' (31). Together these verbal tags affirm his status as a God-fearing Christian man, who defines himself in relation to a patriarchal order, seriously qualifying the extent to which he might be described as 'other' to his English counterparts.

But in a more compelling, because perplexing, twist on this character, Shakespeare structures the play so that Macmorris's vision of the siege of Harfleur—defined by a swift advance and the use of explosives to '[blow] up the town' (3.3.34)—infuses Henry's own address to the governor of the city, which occurs just moments later. In this repetition and appropriation we witness Henry grafting Macmorris's vision of war onto his own, defining his troops as 'men proud of destruction' (81) and himself as a 'soldier' who, once the battery has begun, 'will not leave the half-achieved Harfleur / Till in her ashes she lie buried' (82, 85–6). Like Macmorris, he voices a total devotion to the war and fantasizes the city's destruction by fire. Through this seemingly inconsequential act of mimicry, Henry enacts a linguistic graft, hybridizing England and himself by absorbing the posture and perspective of the profusive Irish captain. In fact, if Willy Maley is right to read Macmorris not as an Irishman but as an already hybridized Old-Englishman—a Norman-Irish figure—it makes even better sense that Henry would wish to join forces, or conjoin, with him: viewed this way, Macmorris boasts the power of the grafted plant to rise up rapidly and 'overlook' his grafters.³²

A similar pattern might be traced to Henry's relation to other British 'neighbours', including the Scots and the Welsh, whose powers Henry grafts onto his own by miming their words and defining behaviours. We learn, for instance, in the opening scene that the Scot is feared for his tendency to come 'pouring like the tide into a breach / With ample and brim fullness of his force' (1.2.149–50). Later, at Harfleur, Henry will appropriate the style of this 'giddy neighbour' (1.2.145) for himself and his men when he wills their transformation into a sea-like force that will 'o'erwhelm' the 'breach' (3.1.11, 1) of Harfleur's walls like the 'wild and wasteful ocean' (3.1.14). Still later, the enemy will echo these rhetorical connections when the French King urges his men to defend against an English foe whose 'approaches makes as fierce / As waters to the sucking of a gulf' (2.4.9–10). The overwhelming natural properties of water provide a fluid metaphor to convey the force of Henry's assault, as well as its capacity to submerge Harfleur under its power. Such 'blending' of

³¹ See Andrew Murphy, "'Tish Ill Done": Henry the Fifth and the Politics of Editing', in *Shakespeare and Ireland*, ed. Burnett and Wray, 213–34.

³² See Maley's third chapter in *Nation, State, Empire* for analysis of a passage in Holinshed that suggests Macmorris's name evokes an Old English identity (45–61).

disparate forces is conveyed, as well, through Henry's adoption of the leek as the symbol of a partnership between Welsh and English. When Henry appoints Fluellen to be his proxy to settle his conflict with Williams, he implicitly condones a merging of their bodies into one, approving the captain as a stand-in for himself. If Henry's emulation of Macmorris is implied but never directly voiced, he explicitly sanctions Fluellen for embodying similar attributes, praising him for being 'valiant / And touched with choler, hot as gunpowder' (4.7.164-5). Earlier, the king had acknowledged the benefit the English had accrued from this alliance when he paid tribute to the Welsh by wearing a leek in his cap, a kind of sartorial mimicry of a Welsh custom (4.7.95-6). A sign of the (imperial) fruit yielded of an earlier partnership between Welsh and English, the leek is a fitting symbol of their union. For, as Fluellen reminds us, it recalls a 'garden where leeks did grow' (90-1) and, by implication, the good husbandry that enabled this garden to thrive under the cooperative union of Welsh and English who together deflected an encroaching Saxon army.³³ In donning the styles, symbols, rhetoric, and postures of England's neighbours, Henry transforms England into a mingled nation by wilfully modifying—even mangling—the lines of kind set down by nature.³⁴

The final scene of the play, portraying Henry's wooing of Catherine, brings this trope of grafted conjunctions to its most literal conclusion, for here Henry extends the logic of the imperial graft to encompass the 'world's best garden' (Epi., 7), as embodied by the French princess. If their union has been compellingly read as a sublimated version of a rape, in which Catherine's agency is obliterated and her identity 'Englished', I offer but a minor qualification.³⁵ It is a wonderful irony that Henry, who 'husbands' this moment of 'dear conjunction' (5.2.324) in which two princes and nations 'receive each other' (340) across the lines of kind, assumes the position previously assigned to his Celtic 'neighbours'. In their act of conjoining to produce offspring 'half-French, half-English' (5.2.195), echoing the grafter's promise of fruit 'halfe apple and halfe pear', Henry assumes the position of 'wild stock' awaiting the graft of Catherine's delicate scion.³⁶ He both frames himself and is framed by the episode as the less-valued pair of the coupling, lacking courtesy and eloquence yet displaying a soldier's spirit. Catherine's language reiterates this perspective, since she worries that their union not stain her, whether through Henry's vulgar tongue,

³³ For discussion of the Welsh leek as a device that conveys 'instabilities within "British" unity', see Patricia Parker, 'Uncertain Unions: Welsh Leeks in *Henry V*', in *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. David J. Baker and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 81-100, esp. 83.

³⁴ Early modern writers often combined *mingle* with *mangle* to describe a compound mixture of food, words, or people. In his description of Ireland for Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Richard Stanyhurst observes of the settlers in Ireland, 'They haue made a mingle mangle of both the languages, and haue in such medley or checkerwyse so crabbedly iumbled them both together' (*OED*, *chequer-wyse*, adv.). While Stanyhurst associates this phrase with contamination, John Lyly imagines a positive valence for the global forces shaping a mingle-mangle theatre in that they have woven the plain 'broadcloth' of England into a more desirable 'arras'; see *Midas*, ed. George K. Hunter and David Bevington, *Galatea and Midas* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), 'The Prologue in Paul's'. See also the discussion of 'mingle-mangle' in Jenny C. Mann, *Outlaw Rhetoric: Figuring Vernacular Eloquence in Shakespeare's England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 181.

³⁵ See Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (London: Routledge, 1997), 213-15.

³⁶ Markham, *English Husbandman*, 58.

which she judges 'corruptible, gros, et impudique' (3.4.48), or through his rude kisses, which she fears will 'abbaissez votre grandeur' (5.2.236). While her fear of their union's contaminating effects voices a profound unease with mingling bodies across national divides, such concerns about purity, the episode suggests, do not align with England's imperial future, and the French princess, hesitant though she may be, is grafted on to Henry's hardier stock.

Subsequently, we learn that if the graft took, it did not do so for long. The Chorus reminds us that the fruit of this royal graft—the future King Henry VI—did not thrive, contrary to the strengths typically associated with the graft. Far from securing the union of England and France as an imperial hybrid, his rule witnessed the loss of his father's French territories, suggesting a critique of mixture as a means of empire and expansion. The Epilogue, however, extracts a different lesson. Shifting blame from Henry VI to his English advisers, the Chorus observes that it was 'they [who] lost France' (Epi., 12, emphasis added), rather than the king. In singling out their poor 'management' of the 'infant' graft (Epi., 9) as the cause of England's eclipse, Shakespeare suggests it was less the principle of grafting itself than the poor husbandry of those assigned to nurture it that brought about this pass. Had skilled hands been available, the Epilogue intimates, England might have unfurled its hybrid power onto more distant lands, embracing the Turk lying just beyond Henry's grasp (5.2.196). Indeed, the play also implies that the imperial fruit of this union may have waited to the time of Shakespeare's present to reach fruition, since the Chorus casts an admiring gaze on England's own 'conqu'ring Caesar'—whether Essex or Mountjoy—whom he expects 'in good time' may return from Ireland 'Bringing rebellion broached on his sword' (5.0.28, 31–2).³⁷

ROMAN BRITAIN

Where *Henry V* portrays a moment of imperial expansion, *Cymbeline* dramatizes a moment of contraction for the nation, representing Britain in the wake of its conquest by Rome, when it was subject to this external power and obliged to pay it yearly tribute. Rising up against Rome in the course of the play, Britain appears to reclaim something of its heroic stature familiar to us from the earlier play, but for the fact of the play's bizarre conclusion: though victorious in combat with Rome, Britain concedes to paying the tribute that first motivated its revolt. This moment has puzzled critics for centuries: Why would Shakespeare mar Britain's victory by highlighting this act of submission?³⁸ Why cloud a representation of national vigour with an assertion of imperial dependency? I propose that upending insular nationhood and British exceptionality is precisely the point. In

³⁷ For the suggestion that Shakespeare's 'conqu'ring Caesar' is an allusion to Essex, see Annabel Patterson, *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1991), esp. 81–8. For the possibility of Mountjoy, see Michael Neill, 'Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic of Power in Shakespeare's Histories', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994), 1–32.

³⁸ Eighteenth-century productions of the play often eliminated any reference to tribute; see Valerie Wayne, 'Cymbeline: Patriotism and Performance', in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works: The Poems, Problem Comedies, Late Plays*, ed. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 389–407, esp. 391. For recent criticism of this ending, see M. J. Redmond, "My lord, I fear, has forgot

foregrounding the debt to Rome, the play insists on identifying Britain as a hybrid formation, highlighting its history as a nation forged through dynamic conjunctions with other imperial powers. It is Britain's contact with—if not subjection to—Rome that has made her great. Such a vision, I suggest, underpins *Cymbeline*'s preoccupation with dead trees, grafted branches, and acts of transplantation.

Indeed it is no exaggeration to observe that vulnerable vegetative forms populate the landscape of *Cymbeline*. Such a motif appears as the central image of the prophecy given to Posthumus informing him of a 'stately cedar' 'lopped' of its branches and 'dead many years' (5.5.234–5). But similar motifs recur throughout the play, as when Innogen identifies herself as a sapling besieged by a wind that 'Shakes all our buds from growing' (1.4.38); when Cloten's headless body is construed as a violated arboreal form in being a 'trunk ... Without his top' (4.2.355–6); or when Belarius describes himself as a once-fruited tree besieged by a storm that 'Shook down [his] mellow hangings' and 'left [him] bare to weather' (3.3.63–4). The repetition of such motifs—of trees felled, severed, and otherwise stripped of generative potential—suggests a kingdom on the wane, one lacking the futurity of buds and spreading branches.³⁹ Armed with an insular ideology fostered by his new queen, Cymbeline precipitates this state of affairs. Not only has he severed Posthumus's graft to his family—the one 'fruitful object' (5.5.149) of Leonatus's heroic genealogical tree—he has also imposed this state of death-in-life on his kinsman and loyal compatriot, Belarius, who reports of a more fertile time before Cymbeline's transformation: "Then was I as a tree / Whose boughs did bend with fruit" (3.3.60–1). Not immune to the effects of his own actions, Cymbeline finds his own future eclipsed: his family tree is shorn of its two princely branches when his two sons are kidnapped from their nursery and the promise of fruit sours when his daughter Innogen flees Britain in search of the spouse he has banished. If Cymbeline, his Queen, and her son imagine that this new British ideology will return the land to its former strengths, the preponderance of barren trees in the play emblemize a more ominous future.

The obstacle for Britain originates with its leaders' embrace of an ideology that insists on insularity for the nation, as for the court. Celebrating Britain as 'a world / By itself' (3.1.12–13), this triumvirate of king, queen, and stepson have taken cover in a way of thinking that guards against mixture, whether of ranks, races, or nations. Cymbeline, for one, recoils from his former embrace of Posthumus as the one surviving son of a martial hero knighted by Caesar, casting him off in words that deliver a sting no less biting than that issued by Prospero to Caliban: "Thou basest thing, avoid hence, from my sight!" (1.1.126). Principles of purity take over the king's worldview, as he comes to define his foster son as alien by virtue of his low birth. His aspiring son-in-law, Cloten, echoes such sentiments in referring to his rival Posthumus as a 'villain', 'banished rascal', and 'whoreson jackanapes' (1.2.12; 2.1.37; 2.1.3). Though a Briton by birth, Posthumus is abjected by epithets that echo the invective heaped on Macmorris. Like the Anglo-Irish captain, Posthumus confounds principles of purity by inhabiting an in-between space in terms of race, rank, and nation. An orphan fostered at court, he is a social composite—both warrior and courtier—as well as an amalgam

Britain": Rome, Italy, and the (Re)construction of British National Identity', in *Shakespeare and Italy. Shakespeare Yearbook 10* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press), 297–316.

³⁹ See my discussion of towering trees and changing relations to soil in 'Groveling with Earth in Kyd and Shakespeare's Historical Tragedies', in *The Indistinct Human*, ed. Feerick and Nardizzi, 231–52.

of national allegiances. In the opening act of the play, he is banished to Rome, but we learn that prior to his exile, he already enjoyed strong ties with the empire, extending his father's friendship with the Roman soldier, Filario. In the shift of loyalties that Posthumus undergoes upon his return to Britain—appearing first in the garb of a Roman soldier, then as a British peasant, and back again—we witness a symbolic rendering of his composite identity, his status as a graft conjoining the hardy stock of a Briton with the civil scion of Rome.

Insofar as the king distances himself from this figure who mingles British and Roman attributes, he reproves precisely that which has made Britain great. For contact with Rome under Caesar, as Posthumus reminds Filario, had evoked a crucial change in Britain years before Cymbeline's rule, grafting onto the vigour and spirit of its people a quality they were lacking: culture, order, and skill. In the years after the conquest, Posthumus observes, Britons became 'men more ordered ... Their discipline, / Now wing-led with their courage' to form a 'people such / That mend upon the world' (2.4.20–6). The emendation provided by the 1632 Folio—which identifies the original typeset word *wing-led* as a possible compositor's error for *mingled*—suggests that the language he speaks may embrace the powers of a grafted union, celebrating the conjunction of a civil culture with the strength and power of a savage people.⁴⁰ By casting off Posthumus, then, Cymbeline rejects the graft of Rome, undoing Britain by sanctioning the Queen's insular perspective as an ideal for the nation.

That Britain's future depends upon reclaiming its links to Rome is indicated by the movements of Cymbeline's royal offspring: Innogen, but also Arviragus and Guiderius. All of them cross the border defining Britain—the Severn—entering a foreign land that serves to hybridize them.⁴¹ If, as royals, they have been born to a kind of natural culture—being the 'bran' of human dust as against its 'meal' (4.2.27)—their movement to Cambria or Wales causes them to be 'enchafed' (4.2.175) by savage conditions. The princes learn 'hardiness' (3.6.22) from their 'savage hold' (3.6.18), assuming qualities both 'gentle' and 'rough' (4.2.172, 174), hunting for food and living in a modest cave. Innogen, too, becomes hybridized by her travels west, first through her assumption of male clothing and then by appropriating savage behaviours, as when she brands her cheeks with what she thinks is Posthumus's blood. Innogen's actions in Wales serve to externalize qualities that already define her as an emblem of Britain. Cloten has hailed her as a woman 'of all compounded' (3.5.73), even as Belarius notes the hybrid nature of her temperament, wondering how 'so divine a temple' can 'commix / With winds that sailors rail at' (4.2.57–8). In severing her connection to Posthumus, her father threatens this delicate compound, undoing it, ironically, with his newfound creed of purity of blood.

In the military confrontation with Rome that concludes the play, such purity is found to be Britain's undoing. Under pressure from an encroaching Roman power, the British troops scatter in disorder, although it appears they are the stronger force. Notably, only when the savage Welsh princes and Posthumus combine their strengths, signalling a union of savage and civil, of Briton and Roman, does British vigour regain its principle of order,

⁴⁰ But see Valerie Wayne's forthcoming edition of *Cymbeline* for the Arden Shakespeare, Third Series, which argues for the retention of the Folio's 'wing-led' on the grounds that contemporaries used wings to refer to divisions in a military formation, and that the play elsewhere uses the term in this way, as when Posthumus describes the defeated king as having been 'Of his wings destitute' (5.5.5).

⁴¹ See my discussion of this play's transmigrations in *Strangers in Blood: Relocating Race in the Renaissance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 78–112.

ensuring the Britons a victory. Later, at court, Cymbeline will, unknowingly, identify Posthumus as the figure who made the victory possible, describing himself, though king, as 'The heir of [his] reward' (5.6.13). In saying as much, he sanctions the graft of his son-in-law, no longer perceiving the low-born Posthumus as 'Poison to [his] blood' (1.1.129). When Posthumus steps forward to be reunited with Innogen, urging her to 'Hang there like fruit, my soul, / Till the tree die' (5.6.263-4), their embrace forms a crisp emblem of the imperial graft, emblemizing the merger of high and low, prince and beggar, spirit and fruit that will make Britain imperial.

Of course, this last scene also fulfils the prophecy delivered by Jupiter (5.5.232-7), the grafting of 'lopped branches' to the 'stately cedar' (5.5.234), in staging the reunion of the princes with the king. The royal tree, once shorn and barren of fruit, is thereby '[revived]' (5.5.235) and ready to thrive once more. But what of this bizarre image of branches being re-'jointed' (5.5.235) to a parent tree? Grafting, as we have seen, is an art that conjoins two *unlike* plants to yield a better fruit. Rejoining branches to a parent tree, by contrast, would seem a meaningless expense of time and labour, an act of grafting in practice but not in principle. As such, this concluding gesture would seem to qualify, if not overwrite, the image of British hybridity I have traced with one of endogamy. And yet, the emphasis on the act of rejoining these severed botanical parts works against notions of pure lineal identity by foregrounding an act of cultivation, and I propose that in this royal reunion, as in the conjunction of newlyweds and the waving 'Friendly together' of 'A Roman and a British ensign' (5.6.480-1), the play stages yet another conjunction of *unlike* kinds.⁴² The princes, after all, have been transplanted to Wales and reared far from court, renaturing them over time and making them 'strange shoots' to the native tree of their father, as evidenced by their performance of deeds that would never be tolerable at court. Their return to court smuggles back into Britain the savage tinge of that soil. In closing with this trebled motif of the grafting of unlike trees, bodies, and ensigns, Shakespeare underscores an equation of hybridity with Britain, defining its mingle-mangle body as the key to its imperial future.

Both *Henry V* and *Cymbeline* dramatize a liminal moment in the imperial history of England/Britain when the boundaries of the kingdom were uncertain, either threatened by transgression or positioned for expansion. Generically, such moments present a range of representational options to the dramatist. These two plays, though classified in the Folio under the rubrics of history and tragedy, share a tendency to represent their subjects comedically, concluding with the sanction of marriages between couples marked by differences of ancestral race, rank, and nation. Such unions hybridize the nation and position it on the path to empire, emblemizing the logic of the graft, with its principle of mixing kinds to form superior compounds. The same conditions do not hold for many plays in Shakespeare's corpus, some of which figure the mixing of peoples across nation, race, and rank as disruptive events for families, nations, even empires. Tragedies such as *Titus Andronicus* and *Othello* adhere to this quite different representational trajectory, portraying mixtures across cultural and racial divides as highly problematic events. But in *Henry V* and *Cymbeline* it is the destiny of individuals, nations, and empires who commix to thrive, even to rise up the hierarchy of terms defining the graft and claim the dominant position of

⁴² For discussion of the rhetoric of joints in Shakespeare, see Patricia Parker's chapter "'Rude Mechanical': A *Midsummer Night's Dream* and Shakespearean Joinery", in *Shakespeare from the Margins: Language, Culture, Context* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 83-115.

scion in the 'now' of some imperial future. This is the story of Henry's forebears, who have commixed with their Norman conquerors in an earlier era and now rise up to defeat them at Agincourt, and it may motivate the positioning of three spirited British captains who have had vexed histories vis-à-vis England at the play's representational centre. The hybrid powers they embody are crucial to England's imperial future. So, too, is Posthumus in *Cymbeline's* staging of a still earlier moment of British history. As a figure who dynamically conjoins opposed identities—Roman and British, low-born and courtly—he is the lynchpin who secures Britain's integrity and its parity with Rome. In surveying a past chequered by conquests and occupations in these plays, Shakespeare discovers an England/Britain whose identity has never been other than mingled. Hers is a future that might indeed be imperial provided she emulate poet and grafter alike in defacing nature's forms, mangling the laws of kind that (too) rigidly pattern people according to conditions of race, rank, and nation.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bovilsky, Lara, *Barbarous Play: Race on the English Renaissance Stage* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).
- Bushnell, Rebecca, *Green Desire: Imagining Early Modern English Gardens* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).
- Feerick, Jean, *Strangers in Blood: Relocating Race in the Renaissance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010).
- Feerick, Jean, and Vin Nardizzi, eds, *The Indistinct Human in Renaissance Literature* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
- Floyd-Wilson, Mary, *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Floyd-Wilson, Mary, and Garrett Sullivan, eds, *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).
- Keilen, Sean, *Vulgar Eloquence: On the Renaissance Invention of English Literature* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).
- Maley, Willy, *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
- Mann, Jenny C., *Outlaw Rhetoric: Figuring Vernacular Eloquence in Shakespeare's England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012).
- Munroe, Jennifer, and Rebecca Laroche, eds, *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- Nardizzi, Vin, *Wooden Os: Shakespeare's Theatres and England's Trees* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013).
- Paster, Gail Kern, *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
- Rubright, Marjorie, *Doppelgänger Dilemmas: Anglo-Dutch Relations in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014).
- Schmidgen, Wolfram, *Exquisite Mixture: The Virtues of Impurity in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

Smith, Ian, *Race and Rhetoric in the Renaissance: Barbarian Errors* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Thomas, Keith, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England, 1500–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Watson, Robert N., *The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).