The Demarcation Zone:

The Victorian Search for a Global Past

Sumayyah Daud

A dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2020

Reading Committee:

Jesse Oak Taylor, Chair

Charles LaPorte

Juliet Shields

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Department of English

The Demarcation Zone:
The Victorian Search for a Global Past

Introduction

In the winter of 2017, I prepared to turn the manuscript of my fiction debut over to the capable hands of my copy editor. I had spent two years toiling over it—a space opera inspired by my Moroccan roots that reveled equally in the medieval and futuristic. I had spent a great deal of the time during which I wrote it simultaneously studying for exams, reading books on translation theory, the history of Arabic translation (both into and out of) and familiarizing myself with as much classical Arabic poetry as I could. As an afterthought, I mentioned to my editor that the poems contained in the manuscript were not mine but written by various Muslim Iberians between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries, and that I had had relied on Raymond Farrin's beautiful translation of Ibn Zaydun's "The Nunniya" in his book *Abundance in the Desert: Classical Arabic Poetry* (2011). I wondered if the publisher's legal department could begin the process of contacting *his* publisher to see if it was alright that I use his translation in my book.

The legal department's response was a simple 'no.' It would be much simpler if I translated it since the poems in question were part of the public domain. It would be easier if I were able to retain copyright over the translation. I think they underestimated the difficulty of that endeavor—much of the rest of the poetry in the book was uncomplicated. They were evocative couplets or quatrains of plain language that I'd been able to translate much of it on my own. But though I've been trained in classical Arabic since I was a schoolgirl and can read the Qur'an with ease, I lacked the scholarly training and depth of knowledge to even begin to approach something like "The Nunniya".

I was lucky in that both my mother and aunt had much of the knowledge I lacked and where their knowledge failed them, they in turn had connections to scholars in Morocco (their country of origin) who could help as well. What followed was several painstaking weeks of going back and forth, line by line, in an attempt to render the poem both beautiful and legible to a reader who would have even less context than me. In the end, the most difficult work was the translation of a single word that we glossed as 'pearl' but that as my mother explained to me in the context of the line also denoted purity, virginity, and loftiness of spirit and character.

In translating "The Nunniya" I sacrificed context and depth of knowledge for elegance and legibility. I'm quite proud of the resulting translation though I'm sure a scholar with a passing familiarity with the original would balk at several things. First, the original poem in its entirety is fifty-one lines, and I selected the three couplets that I deemed most effective in the scene in which it was recited. Second, the poem is called "The Nunniya" because of its form: every line ends in the Arabic letter *nūn*, which in Arabic lends it a rhythm and beauty I had no hope of translating into English. I sacrificed form in the hopes that I could render something that emulated the elegance and beauty of the language to a reader who had no hope of understanding it otherwise. And finally, the context of these lines' recitation is an imaginary planet based on a futuristic, space-faring Morocco that retains some medieval flare. In the world of this novel Ibn Zaydun does not exist, though the story makes the argument that the circumstances that gave rise to the classical forms of Arabic poetry similarly existed on this world.

So: is the fragment of a poem contained in my novel an authentic and accurate rendering of classic medieval Arabic poetry? Can I present it as such even if I clarify that what is contained is only a fragment? Can I present the poems I have rendered in their entirety as authentic? Many readers express that they believe me to be the original author of the poems and those that do

know the poetry is not mine don't know to whom it belongs, when it was written, or the context of its composition. The novel contains no footnotes, and indeed in the scope of the novel there is no space to elaborate on the cultural specificities of where these poems might have been penned (mujalasaat—poetry salons), the cultural rules that governed their composition and recitation, the ways they were used (in this specific context for courtship and to express erudition). Moreover, they are largely ignorant of the history of colonization that the Arabic poetry represents in a novel ostensibly based on Moroccan cultural history that draws heavily on indigenous practice and tradition. There is little space to elaborate on the specific linguistic-colonial tension of a Syrian in Umayyad Cordoba penning an Arabic poem in a novel culturally based on a country that was both colonized by the Arabs and later Arabized. All of these complications are entirely elided because the average reader has no access to the cultural bank of knowledge necessary to parse them.

I would not suggest that the poem contained within the pages of my novel was mine, or not "The Nunniya" or that it was something new entirely. But it's reception and engagement by American English-language readers renders an entirely different artifact than what is presented to my mother who has the cultural dexterity to parse the many levels on which the translation operates and exists. In the act of translating it, I have also introduced it into an entirely new literary landscape and canon—it is not simply a translated medieval Arabic poem but is now wrapped up in a postcolonial critique of empire and possible futures. And it reveals far more about me and the publishing landscape my novel inhabits than it does about its point of origin. As I worked on this novel I also began to work in earnest on my dissertation. The questions regarding poetics and translation, history and context, came to take center stage in the academic writing that emerged, centered as it was around Orientalism in the nineteenth century and the

culture of medieval revival that crystallized during this time. This cross section of revelation and linguistic transformation became the launching point of my dissertation. What new questions arise when we consider not only the points of origin of a translated text, not only the narrow scope within which it was translated, but the new networks that translation becomes integrated into? What new dimensions of both the translation and the works that translation joins in its new cultural contexts reveal themselves in their consideration?

Searching for a Past

This project interrogates not only that contextual history but the ways in which *Nights* and many other Arabic-language texts being translated at the time are in fact contemporaneous with the Anglophone and European medieval texts being translated and the ways in which the Oriental and domestic were in conversation to create a larger, global cultural imaginary within which to situate the British Empire. Much work has been done on the reception history of *Arabian Nights*, its eighteenth- and nineteenth-century context and its effects on the shifting literary landscape of its time and the imagined Orient. Despite the separation of Orientalism and the medieval revival, I contend that in many ways medievalism and Orientalism are in collusion both with each other as separate spheres and with the Imperial-Nationalist project and that they both worked to produce specific ideas about non-Western history, religion, and the East's 'crumbling past' even as they built up the romanticized medieval history through tales and adaptations of a British past.

I define the *Imperial-Nationalist project* as the work done on the imperial and national level to produce a coherent worldview where the imagined national and imperial pasts were in alignment with the imagined national and imperial future. This project included but was not

limited to the imagining of the British Isles as a place where, in the past, one race and one religion ruled and the relegation of the contact zones between the 'Saracen threat' and European Christian forces to places like the battlefields of the crusades. It imagines a past where those borders were in no way permeable either through erasure or omission. It also, importantly, imagines a past for the Near East that is caught in stasis and decay. The Near East encountered in medieval literature, as far the Imperial Nationalist project is concerned, and the Near East encountered in the Victorian moment were not so different to them, except that one was at its beginning, and the other has never moved past that and instead fallen into ruin and decay. Alongside the present image of the Near East is the modern reality of the British Empire in the nineteenth century, its increasing power, wealth, and technology.

The cultural imaginaries both imperial and national were of course more complicated than this and produced an array of contradictory images of both the British and global futures that imagined prosperity as much as it imagined cataclysmic doom. But the Imperial-Nationalist project is an important frame for understanding the way Orientalism and Medievalism operated in collusion with each other and produced a space between them that was both contact zone and a production site for the nineteenth-century British cultural imaginary. And it is this framework that allows this project to approach the transnational and trans-temporal space within which world literature exists and to challenge the 'world' category using the Imperial-National. That is that by applying this framework it becomes apparent that 'world' literature is a national project invested in the present and future priorities of a nation, how it imagines the world at its current moment and its investments in how it hopes to take its place in that world. In the case of the nineteenth-century British world literature landscape, world literature becomes the space through which it can imagine its relations and narrativize its history with the East.

This project attempts to position itself within and bridge the space between three critical conversations: first and second, the studies of medieval revivalism and Orientalism in the Victorian period and the ways in which it shaped the cultural imaginary, and third, the continuing conversation in medieval studies that pulls medieval texts side by side with postcolonial theory. And at the center of this project is *One Thousand and One Nights* and the various forms it has taken from its introduction via Galland all the way through to its formation at the hands of Richard Burton and the ways in which its formation produce and respond to anxieties about genre, national ownership, and the much contested 'world literature'.

Over the course of this dissertation, I argue that reading the Victorian medieval revival alongside instead of apart from the rise of Orientalism both as a study and a practice, opens up new ways of reading and disrupting the East-West dichotomy we think of as deeply embedded in Victorian thinking. I am pushing for a disruption of our understand of 'the medieval' as it was codified by and in the nineteenth century. To do that I turn to scholars such as Alice Chandler, Claire A. Simmons, and Kevin L. Morris who offer a foundation for thinking about the ways the medieval era was framed in the Victorian period, and the multitude of ways it diverged from historical reality (in so much as we can claim to know that reality) in order to build new ground upon which the British national identity could be built. In the introduction to *Beyond Arthurian Romance: The Reach of Victorian Medievalism*, a collection edited by Loretta M. Holloway and Jennifer A. Palmgren, the editors write, "popular culture embraced medievalism so much that the historic Middle Ages became, in many ways, of secondary importance to the majority of Victorians. In fact, most Victorians drew their impressions of the Middle Ages from Sir Walter Scott's novels rather than from any historical medieval text. As Clare A. Simmons asserts, Victorian medievalism focuses on "the individual's needs and desires" rather than in

"discovering the authentic past." Thus, everything about this "history" became a matter of interpretation, not an "authentic past" but an authentic fantasy" (1). This underscores the Victorian medieval revival project that I wish to put pressure on—that is, the ways that imaginary pasts were evoked to shape national identity and national futures in the nineteenth century.

To make a larger point about the ways that Orientalism and the medieval revival were in conversation, I focus largely on translations and adaptations of *One Thousand and One Nights. Nights* popularity rose in the nineteenth century, spawning several English grub street versions, various translations published widely and funneled through subscriber societies, culminating in Richard Burton's translation in 1885. I build on the work of Srinivas Aravamudan's *Enlightenment Orientalism: Resisting the Rise of the Novel* (2011) and its assertion that "Enlightenment Orientalism was not "a corporate institution for dealing with the Orient" but a fictional mode for dreaming with the Orient—dreaming with it by constructing and translating fictions about it, pluralizing views of it, inventing it, by reimagining it, unsettling its meaning, brooding over it. In short, Enlightenment Orientalism was a Western style for translating, anatomizing, and desiring the Orient" (8). Ros Ballaster's *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England 1662-1785* (2005), like Aravamudan's work, challenges the assumptions of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1979), framing the movement of the Oriental tale in the eighteenth century as two-way exchange and plotting the diverse ways that reading tales of the Orient framed their understanding of the geopolitical space. More specifically turning to scholarship about *One Thousand and One Nights* Saree Makdisi and Felicity Naussbaum's essay collection *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West* (2009) focuses on both reception history and the impact that *Nights* had on the Western literary scene in the eighteenth and nineteenth

centuries. Eva Sallis' *Sheherazade Through the Looking Glass: The Metamorphosis of the Thousand and One Nights* (1990) also focuses on the ways that *Nights* changed and transformed as it came into contact and was used in nineteenth-century literature.

The scholarly intervention I propose attempts to join these scholarly conversations much in the way one might suture two pieces of a map together. Scholarship about the ways in which culture, material, and ideologies circulate in empire abound, but very little of it interrogates how pressuring the demarcation between ideas entering the national sphere from the imperial generates possibilities and what happens when ideologies of how the British Empire imagined its historical self are read *against* its historical imaginings of the Other, especially when that (often Muslim and Arab) other was at its economic and political height in terms of strength while England was not yet a power.

Buttressing this work is scholarship on the postcolonial medieval. In the collection of essays, *A Sea of Language: Rethinking the Arabic Role in Medieval Literary History* (2013), Akbari writes, "A look back at *The Arabic Role in Medieval Literary History*, however, reveals a suspicion of early modernity to be an abiding element of [Menocal's] thinking: already in 1987, she linked the Renaissance privileging of classical antiquity to "the critical notion, which remains strong today, of essential continuity and unity of Western civilization from the Greeks through fifteenth-century Italy." It is, as she points out, "a notion of history formulated as much to deny the medieval past and its heritage as to establish a new and more worthy ancestry." Moreover, "the depiction of the medieval world as a dark age…is still operative in many spheres today" (5, emphasis added)" (25). What scholars like she, Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, Maria Rosa Menocal, and Nabil Matar argue for is crucial to this project: That not only was the East-West division necessary for imagining empire a fabrication of the Victorian era, but that by excavating

the ways in which two imaginary maps are in fact sutured to one another we uncover new and generative ways of understanding a global past.

My intent is not to 'correct' the Victorian understanding or imaginations of the middle ages, but rather to interrogate and read against that imagining. What new understandings or readings of Victorian engagement with imagined pasts emerge when the history they present for readers—demarcated, separate, homogenous—are challenged by their own archives of conflict, contact, and enmeshment with the imagined and real East? How do their interactions with monarchy and self-rule shift or clarify when British or English medieval imaginings are read against ways they shape and erect imaginations of the East?

Scholarly conversations about the medieval revival and the Oriental tale are largely invested in two things: the production of the British past (whether authentic or fantasy) or the Oriental past. These discussions however reproduce the demarcations discussed in the opening of this introduction—that is, the demarcation between East and West and the impermeable border between them. This project instead brings these archives into conversation in order to outline how the domestic and foreign focus worked to produce a world literature that supported a national and imperial project. By investing in a first contact narrative mediated through Galland's manuscript of *Nights* and reproducing it through historical and Oriental fictions, the works selected for this dissertation imagine if not an untouched British Isles, then preserved for the future British, with an unruly and decaying world outside its borders.

This project pulls together a constellation of medieval revivalist and Victorian Orientalist archives to produce a stronger understanding of the ways that the domestic national identity and the imperial one relied on demarcated literary spaces that were nevertheless in conversation with one another—that is, the relegation of multicultural cosmopolitanism that was present in the

middle ages to spaces like the crusades and not being brought *home* then worked in conjunction with the differing representations of the Oriental as despotic, savage and so on. As the medieval history built a case for British sovereignty and justification for its imperial expansion, so too did Oriental history and tales then clear both the imperial map and history to be taken up by British outposts and governments. My intent is to demonstrate the ways in which Victorian discourses on history shaped not only domestic anxieties but that those anxieties permeated in the continued reconfiguration and understanding of 'the Orient' as a place and a *time*.

Rather than attempting to produce or locate an authentic *Arabian Nights,* this project argues that that readers and scholar's inability to pin down an authentic version produced anxieties linked to the imperial and 'scientific' desire to catalogue the East. Its effect on nineteenth-century literature is indisputable, but the response to its introduction to the West, its hand in producing the imaginary Orient, and the response from Arabic-speaking countries to produce more Oriental tales to feed the Western imagination, all feed anxieties about national ownership of a literary object that at its most 'complete' spans three volumes. Rather than attempt to allay those anxieties this project instead proposes to engage them in unpacking the reproduction of demarcated space referred to in the opening of this introduction—that is, that the struggle for a complete manuscript, the anxieties about its positioning as high or low art in the Arabic-speaking world are directly connected to the moment of its 'discovery' by Galland and reproduce the separation of the Oriental past from the British one.

These scholarly foundations work to support the central aim of this project, which is both to argue for a reframing of how we envision world literature and to reframe the ways that we write about *Arabian Nights* and its various forms. To inhabit the mechanisms of translation that haunt and follow it in its English form I argue we cannot only look at the corpus of *Arabian*

Nights or its entrance into Europe via Galland, but instead the system that not only made its entrance possible but allowed it to flourish. David Damrosch, in his essay "What is World Literature?" (2003) argues (and rightly so) that translated works are often positioned as windows to other worlds while also being reflective of the host culture's values. Damrosch's 'refractions' are a useful framework for my reading of nineteenth-century reception of *Nights*. Much of its scholarship circles and engages with the ways *Nights* translations and adaptations complicate, replicate, and engage with Orientalism and imperial power structures. Mention is made of its great influence among writers of the time, but in an English literary context where its eighteenth and nineteenth century cultural divestment and reframing would reflect on cultural views of the time and engage with them. So when I speak of world literature I speak not only of Orientalists and translators, but the poets, novelists, and historians who engaged and were aware of it, the literary systems of production and reception that made its dissemination possible, and the thematic and cultural discourses that would have made space for it and engaged it in discourse.

To buttress these arguments, I turn to scholarship on the 'untranslatable' and translation failure done by Emily Apter and Abdelfattah Kilito. Like Kilito and Apter both, I "harbor serious reservations about tendencies in World Literature toward reflexive endorsement of cultural equivalence and substitutability, or toward the celebration of nationally and ethnically branded "differences" that have been niche-marketed as commercialized "identities"" (2). In her introduction to *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability* (2013), she writes, "…translation studies and World Literature ignored problems more internal to their theoretical premises. With translation assumed to be a good thing *en soi*—under the assumption that it is a critical praxis enabling communication across languages, cultures, time periods and disciplines—the right to the Untranslatable was blindsided. In a parallel way, at its very core World Literature

seemed oblivious to the Untranslatable…" (8). Apter and Kilito provide a theoretical groundwork for the reframing this project does around world literature. That is, how it pushes against embedded theories of translation and world literature, and instead proposes how nineteenth-century translation practices and the economy of global, translated work can be read as nationalistic projects attempting to articulate a world literature that is nonetheless still firmly rooted in the national and imperial.

The purpose of focusing on these processes of translation is to underscore an important ideological basis of this project: that a true world literature does not exist. No text belongs to any one nation or culture, even by moving or translation, but rather always exists in tension with itself as an artifact of migration and power. In speaking of the linguistic and cultural legacy that moved through the West by way of the East—and the way it frames the *Nights* entrance into Europe—she writes, "Although historically many people have read both Arabic or Turkish and a Latin-based language, many more have mastered only one linguistic family, and to these readers not only the other language, but also the traces that it has left on their native tongues are virtually impossible to decipher. *As a result, the crucial interface between Romance and Arabic languages and literatures, Christian and Muslim cultures, has to a great extent been a blind interface: a border that is at once highly permeable and rigidly impenetrable*" [emphasis mine.] (29). That permeable/impenetrable dichotomy is the foundation on which the national-world literature sits—even as *Nights* moves in its various forms through European and British literary hemispheres specifically, it leaves behind much of its baggage and cultural framework. Its eighteen- and nineteenth-century readers encounter it under an entirely different set of resonances. It's fourteenth-century reception was framed by a deep nostalgia for the 'Golden Age' of Islam, highlighted by the presence of its most famous caliph, Haroun al-Rachid. Its

encounters with the West reflect alternately Oriental fever, anxieties about democracy and monarchy, and an imperial and national desire to render the East as both knowable and perennially ancient. The tension between what it *was* and what it *becomes* is never lost, only forgotten.

The Global Medieval

At the heart of my dissertation is an argument for reworking the paradigms and barriers that place the rise of Orientalism and the medieval revival in separate spheres. The two are linked not simply by time period but by their concerns with history and by the translation that brought many Oriental works into the nineteenth-century English canon. It is my assertion that Victorian writers, translators and scholars worked—consciously or unconsciously—to continue to decouple East and West for both national and imperial purposes despite recent and not so recent history that make it clear the two have never been as distinct as they are presented. It is not only that the religiously and culturally distinct Europe evoked in Victorian imagination did not exist, not only that it was home to religious and cultural Others, but that the cultural and literary effect of such mixing did not dissipate as Enlightenment-era nationalisms emerged, but was instead exacerbated by them. Instead I argue for the ways those effects not only persisted but emerge in Victorian imaginings of an English or European past when they are put in conversation and read alongside or against Orientalists' appropriations, adaptations, and translations of a coterminous Arab medieval past. What emerges from the examination of this conflict is what is at the heart of my argument: a new framework for interrogating the competing differences between the reality of the middle ages and their counterparts in the Victorian imaginary, and the ways those realities come into conflict with the nineteenth century literary

landscape. I use this framework to tease out how the Victorian medieval revival as it emerged in literature was engaged in shoring up the ways that Eastern medieval history was constructed in the British cultural imaginary. To do this, as I will later discuss, I focus on *1001 Nights*, its translations, importation into the Victorian literary landscape, and how when it is read *alongside* Victorian texts a new facet of historical imagining emerges.

In the preface to her seminal work *The Arabic Role in Medieval Literary History* (1987) María Rosa Menocal details the etymological rift between Romance philology scholars and Arabists that led to the writing of her book. She traces the history of the word *troubadour,* a word that for a long time proved a large mystery to philologists and the source of a deep well of scholarship. It was when she took an Arabic class that the rift between Romance philologists and Arabists became clear—Arabists believed that the Arabic word *taraba* (to sing) was the clear antecedent to the word *troubadour* and that both linguistically and historically it made sense: it would have arisen in Muslim Spain between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries in a time when Arabic was part and parcel of the intellectual culture of Muslim Iberia—and many intellectual centers in Europe at the time—and where poetry and song were the literary bedrock of these courts. Despite that, for a long time Romance philologists dismissed the possibility while Arabists who argued for it did so while scaffolding their arguments around the assumption that Romance philologists would continue to ignore the possibility. Menocal uses this schism to highlight a paradigm that has shaped medieval studies from its nascent form in the nineteenth century up until the writing of her book in 1987—a firm demarcation between East and West that kept both literature and the attendant culture separate.

Menocal outlines the establishment of the demarcation between East and West by rooting it in the emergence of cultural and national identity in the Renaissance and Enlightenment. In

order to establish the Renaissance—a time of discovery and connection with the classical Greek and Roman texts as cultural heritage—the middle ages then had to be viewed as dark or cut off from that lineage. The establishment of such a paradigm elides a crucial truth: the middle ages were not dark and in fact Europe contained many centers of learning, and that these places were multilingual with Arabic, Spanish, French, Latin and Italian co-existing in many medieval European courts. Frederick II's Norman court in Sicily was one such place. Frederick himself hosted Muslims, Jews, and Christians, and he himself spoke Arabic with enough proficiency that he regularly corrected his translators. He communicated with philosophers and scholars both Greek and Arab, and the culture of his court was so firmly enmeshed with the East that he was viewed with suspicion by the Church and fellow Europeans both.

What is important and notable about Frederick and courts akin to his is that they acted as conduits and places of transfer. Much of the Western philosophical tradition came by way of Arabic translations—the Arabs translated Greek and Roman philosophical texts like Aristotle and those Arabic texts were in turn translated into Latin, Spanish, Italian and so on. Frederick II had a deep interest in science and philosophy and in fact adapted the Aristotelian method of scientific observation by way of observing and reading commentaries from his Arab counterparts. The secular and humanist pursuit of knowledge that we associate largely with the Enlightenment began in the twelfth century and was fueled in large part by the translation efforts in courts like his and, importantly, in Arab and Muslim courts as well. Much of what we term the Western Classic tradition survived because of translation efforts of the Arabs and the continued and fluid exchange of knowledge between what we think of as East and West. Menacol writes that "admission of the existence of such phenomena would not only have robbed the later period of its claims to being a renascence, at least in any dramatic and absolute way, but it would also

have deprived it (and us, since in the great measure we continue to cling to that particular historical dialect) of that clear-cut distinction between the two periods that is dominant in modern European historical mythology." She continues by saying that "the remainder of the myth, the crystallization of the concept of Europeanness and its ancestry, was largely spun out in the nineteenth century, and it played a critical role at this moment of high-pitched awareness of the particularity and superiority of Europe that came with the imperial and colonial experience and the post-Romantic experience with the Orient" (6).

It is this 'crystallization' that I seek to pressure. While Edward Said argues convincingly for the ways the Occident created and shaped the Orient as a dominant force and enforced their belief that they were superior, I wish to complicate this argument. I argue that the Orient was no silent victim to this and that the legacy of the Orient is embedded in Western literature. By reading the medieval revival as a nationalist project mainly concerned with problems at home as attendant to British identity and reading that revival as separate or apart from the Orient and Victorian imaginings of a medieval Orient, we rob ourselves of a dimension and facet of understanding of what lies in these texts. It is no accident that the luminaries of the age had *Arabian Nights*, *Thalaba the Destroyer* (1801), and *Vathek* (1786) on their shelves. Nor is it surprising that some of the brightest minds of the age bent their efforts towards translating *Arabian Nights* and other such texts. East and West have never truly been apart even as the national imaginary works hard to separate them and new historical paradigms framing the past attempt to extricate themselves from this cultural mix—as if the demarcation between East and West has created a real and physical barrier between European Christians and those who were not. The purpose, then, of addressing our understanding of the medieval historical paradigm is two-fold: to reframe our understanding of the multiple and competing differences and realities in

the middle ages, and to then pressure and interrogate the ways those realities emerge and erupt in nineteenth-century literature. I want to push against the inclination to assign one nation or culture as being the shaper of another, and instead interrogate the ways in which mixing and coexisting whether peacefully or antagonistically produces new ways of knowing and engaging with literature of a time or place.

My purpose in tracing the consistent contact between the ideas of East and West is not to suggest a lineage or even a *linear* development, but to emphasize and highlight how Arabic literature and thought interacted with and shaped medieval literature *as well as* how the emerging institutions of Victorian medievalism alongside British imperial interests reshaped the dialogue and literary imagination that plotted out encounters between East and West. As Menocal wishes to reshape our understanding of what new dimensions medieval literature might gain when we rework our understanding of the historical paradigm through which we see the past, so too do I believe that carrying that understanding *forward* and considering the ways that this reconfigured paradigm affected and shaped the nineteenth-century medieval revival excavates new dimensions and questions about the Victorian literary landscape.

Precis of Chapters

The first chapter "The Re/Making of a Medieval Text" traces the history of *Arabian Nights* from its point of origin in the ninth and tenth centuries, its critical reception in the Arabic-speaking medieval world, and its status as a peripheral and maligned text. From there, it traces its multiple and varied translations in the West and its reception and effect on the literary landscape from the eighteenth century on. This chapter asks: How do the translations and adaptations of *Arabian Nights* reflect or engage with a new literary ecosystem? How do we understand the multiplicity of the text and its positioning in a Western literary landscape when that translation is

not framed not only as an act of colonialism or imperialism but as part of a longer extended literary tradition of intellectual engagement between East and West? From there we move to the second chapter, "*Ivanhoe*, Richard the Lionheart and Haroun al-Rachid". There we take up the methodology of reading *Arabian Nights* alongside a product of the medieval revival with the aim of excavating the ways that *Ivanhoe* (1819) renders a model of kingship, sovereignty and nation as it is linked to and in conversation with manifestations of rule in the *Arabian Nights*. How can we understand both citizenship and nation when those categories are read alongside their absence in translations of *Arabian Nights*? The final chapter, "*Idylls of the King* and *Arabian Nights*: Discovering Infidelity and Constructing Monarchy" continues the conversation around national identity as it is linked to configuration of kingship and takes that conversation a step further to interrogate the ways in which East and West are linked through constructions of womanhood and femininity. It takes up the medieval specter of fleshly infection—both via cannibalism and sex—in order to argue that Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* (1859) is hunted by the same spectre, even as he attempts to relegate the religious and cultural Other to the margins of England.

Taken as a whole, the project is meant to function as a starting point for way to rethink both the inception of world literature and the medieval revival as national projects. Both my readings of *Ivanhoe* and *Idylls* reveal the ways in which the East is embedded in the literary landscape of the West, not just in a colonial frame but as part of a long history of intellectual and cultural engagement that these works attempt to reframe. To this, we can add the always partially invented past that we (and the Victorians) have come to know as "the medieval," as a period foundational to both Britain's national narrative and broader understandings of "East," "West" and the relations between them. Together they ask what more might we learn or excavate from

"Western" literary history when we don't only approach our current understanding of the middle ages with new historical paradigms, but our Victorian understanding of those paradigms as well?

Chapter One: The Re/Making of a Medieval Text

The Methodology of World Literature

In his book *Thou Shalt Not Speak My Language* Abdelfattah Kilito discusses an incident with a student who has become fluent in Darija, the dialect of Arabic spoken in Morocco. The student is comfortable with its idioms and colloquialisms to such an extent that during the course of a conversation she uses the phrase 'wallahilah' and startles another Kilito's friend (notably, a Moroccan) into laughter. He found the incident bewildering and representational enough that he conveyed it to the reader. His bewilderment lay in both her fluency and in the ways in which *despite* her fluency, no matter how long she lived in Morocco, her status as outsider meant that there was no way for her to truly and completely understand how that phrase was and is embedded in Moroccan culture and erupts in language, since it is a phrase used exclusively in Moroccan Arabic. Kilito uses this moment to highlight his anxiety about outsiders speaking his language—earlier he admits that he does not *want* outsiders to speak his language (hence the title of the essay collection). It is entrenched in the belief that the translator, the bilingual, the cultural mediator, is doomed to failure. For as far as Kilito is concerned bilingualism is entrenched in violence—"It is a matter of mutual injustice and belittlement. There are no oppressive and oppressed languages; when they "meet on the tongue," each is simultaneously an aggressor and a victim. Their relationship is not built on peaceful coexistence but, to the contrary, on tugging, opposition, and quarrel." (22)

I do not wish to entertain Kilito's notions regarding whether or not outsiders should speak our languages, though I can admit to some suspicion when they do. Rather his argument for the violence of bilingualism and the failure of the translator intrigue me, because I find that it is a

functional argument regardless of context. Irrespective of intent, the balance of languages in a translation is never equal—one always wins. My argument is rooted in the argument that movement across linguistic boundaries is difficult and cannot ever *truly* be accomplished.

Translation—both oral and literary—is hampered by the movement not just across language and letters, but from one context to another. In order to make a foreign text legible to a reader a translator must either provide entirely the context of the original text or, failing that, produce a new context by which the text might be newly legible to its reader. I use Kilito's episode because there often seems to be a desire to elide the act of violence in translation in scholarship. Many scholars, I have found, get caught in a loop of either attempting to minimize the violence of translation or elide it entirely and I don't want to lose the possibility of violence that translation often entails. *However*, what is *most* useful to me about this incident is both the student's inability—as characterized by Kilito—to cross the cultural boundary despite her linguistic dexterity, *and* her inability to recognize that she hasn't crossed that boundary—Kilito doesn't convey her reaction to his friend's laughter, only her ignorance. Rather than ask whether one might be able to produce an 'authentic' translation by cultural submersion or assimilation, this chapter asks: what generative readings can we produce when we accept this failure of translation? What new literary landscapes or maps unfold when instead of framing these movements across borders and boundaries as failures or successes, we see them as sites of contradictory makers of meaning?

For me, what that means is turning to *1001/Arabian Nights* and examining how it has slipped across or been carried over borders so often that it has become deeply enmeshed in the English literary milieu. In this chapter I will examine the transmission history of the two branches of *1001 Nights* known as the **Syrian** branch and the **Egyptian** branch. In doing so, I

outline the differences between the branches, their sources, and following that: their translation history. I argue that the Victorian fascination and subsequent fixation on the Egyptian branch is no accident, but born of widespread philological practices of the time, and that this methodology underpins scholarly interventions of the text. They demonstrate in no small way the *how* of erecting world literature and more importantly why that world literature is not worldly at all, but instead national.

This chapter—this project—lies at the intersection of postcolonial studies and world literature. I take 'world literature' to be, as Jennifer Wentzel defines it, the scholarly field whose primary interests lie in "world-systems, trans-national circulation, [and] translatability" and in particular this project is interested in how it imagines a "world of circulation without friction" (8). At its most idealistic, world literature as a field attempts to chart a truly global system of literary exchange and translation. From Pascale Casanova's *The World Republic of Letters* (2004) which charts the movement of texts from the global periphery to cosmopolitan centers, to Franco Moretti's "Conjectures", "More Conjectures" (2000, 2003), and *Maps, Graphs, and Trees* (2007) who proposes a "distance reading", these scholars propose ways of charting and reading how literature moves through global systems. While Moretti relies on *numbers* to build his charts (publication records, scanning large archives, and so on), Casanova traces discrete pathways along the global and literary map from one location to another.

In *What is World Literature?* (2004) David Damrosch proposes that world literature is a way of reading—'*the elliptical refraction of national literatures*'. That the way texts become world literature is by "being received *into* a foreign culture, a space defined in many ways by the host culture's national tradition and the needs of its own writers" (283). He recognizes the problematics of world literature form a scholarship point of view—that 'amateurism' hovers like

a specter over the field. Though I find his suggestions to address the problematics of the field intriguing, I am more interested in how he and other scholars track the movement of texts. That is, that in world literature often the movement is seen as coming from the 'periphery' to the center. The *why* of this is clear: world literature and translation often go (as this project demonstrates) hand in hand, so that a scholar's reading of texts is mediated through translations from one language and into English (as again, is the case in this project), and world literature's opposition to and tension with postcolonial studies then defines a very clear periphery to be brought to the center. Damrosch *does* cast his net wide and yet as both Wenzel and Aamir Mufti make clear in their works, there is a wide-spread eliding of the origins of this field. The field strives towards producing a frame of scholarship that addresses colonial inequalities by highlighting systems and re-centering those that have been historically left out of the canon, and yet does not address the "distinct line of development from emergent cultural practices in eighteenth-century Europe, a line of development that is embedded in the social life of English as a language of literature, Orientalist scholarship, colonial and postcolonial pedagogy, and imperial administration and power" (Mufti, 31).

In his article "Orientalisms and the Institution of World Literatures" (2010) and later in his book *Forget English!* (2016) Aamir Mufti outlines the emergence of world literature as being linked to the institutionalization of philological knowledge, the creation of language trees, and the acquisitive nature of European powers. He writes,

> "My point of entry into this formulation is what I take to be its most consequential misconception: for Casanova, non-Western literary cultures make their first effective appearance in the world literary space in the era of decolonization in the middle of the twentieth century. Casanova thus fails to comprehend the real nature of the expansion and

> rearrangement of this until then largely European space in the course of the philological revolution. It is through the philological knowledge revolution—the "discovery" of classical languages of the East, the invention of the linguistic family tree whose basic form is still with us today, the translation and absorption into the Western languages of more and more works from Persian, Arabic, and the Indian languages, among others—that non-Western textual traditions made their first entry *as literature*, sacred and secular, into the international literary space that had emerged in early modern times in Europe as a structure of rivalries between emerging vernacular traditions, transforming the scope and structure of that space forever. this moment, which she reads almost entirely through Herder, is mistaken by Casanova for a redrawing of the internal cultural map of Europe, rather than as a reorganization that is planetary in nature, in the sense that this emerging constellation of philological knowledge, perhaps best known to us now from Said's reading of it in *Orientalism*, posits nothing less than the language and cultures of the entire world as its object in the final instance." (2010, 459)

Like Mufti, I take the development of philology as an academic practice to be the basis of my reading of practices of world literature, but while Mufti looks at the establishment of literary traditions before their moments of acknowledgement and the ways in which that acknowledgement or global emergence shaped those traditions, I am instead interested in the ways the reception of these literatures shaped *the host culture*. I wish to ask what changes, shifts, and transformations we can track and read when we look to the nation of reception, and the ways that cultural and social history of the text, and of *exchange*, become elided in translation. My

argument is that the emergence of orientalism and philology as academic fields allow scholars to bracket and ignore "a rather obvious historical claim" as Mufti writes (460).

Mufti's imaginary nineteenth-century world library is a useful metaphor here. What happens if instead of only imagining the attendant histories to translated works that entered this library, we also consider what *refractions* reverberate out not just around the translated texts, but the text that no doubt are in conversation with it, that would have been influenced by the author's reading of it. As I will demonstrate in later chapters, scholarship tracking orientalism in Sir Walter Scott and Alfred Tennyson's work abound, but almost exclusively about texts where the Orient is in material evidence. Next to no scholarship exists about the sort of cultural exchange that is *evident* and embedded in the history of *Ivanhoe* and *Idylls of the King* that definitively links the medieval past of the West with the medieval past of the East. This project asks: can we imagine the refractions of a translated text—here, *Arabian Nights*—as a thing that exists beyond Damrosch's elliptical path and also moves through Mufti's world library, affecting and engaging texts of the host culture?

Though this chapter and this project are not being written with an environmental bent, I find that Wenzel's outlining of "a mesh of relations in which the liberatory and immiserating implications of immiserating implications of globalizations—old and new—are knit and laid bare" is useful in thinking through how eighteenth- and nineteenth-century orientalism has uncoupled these various systems to produce both a particular form of translation and particular medieval histories (8). While her reading focuses largely on modern globalizations as a means to understand or read world literature and its enmeshment with environmentalism and climate crisis, her method is also helpful in imagining various scales of the nineteenth-century and medieval maps that this and the following chapters will engage with, tracking transnational

moments of encounter, the ways in which they are elided, and the ways that elision creates sites of tension from which we can draw reading.

This chapter seeks to rework the category we understand as 'world literature' by making use of Sir Richard Francis Burton's translation of *Arabian Nights,* its transcription and translation history, and its reception in Britain in the nineteenth century. It traces the medieval Arabic transcription history, then shifts to the European translation and adaptation history in order to establish the knowledge paradigms under which the collection of stories existed. More specifically, it establishes its 'value' in its early format in the medieval Arabic canon and how that value shifted and was transformed when it came into contact with eighteenth- and later nineteenth-century translators and philologists. The chapter uses Burton as its foundation in large part because Burton's translation became the de facto English version and the basis of much English literature *Arabian Nights* scholarship.

Most scholarship on *Arabian Nights* in English literature treats Burton's, Payne's, Galland's, and various other translations as part of the large polyvalent text collectively known as *1001 Nights.* I argue that this is partly due to nineteenth century philological practice, but that it is also part of a scholarship invested in propping up a globalized 'world literature' that does not truly exist. By laying out the history of *Arabian Nights* and *1001 Nights* I argue that we can re-orient our understanding of world literature from an outward facing network of knowledge transfer to an inward/nation-facing network of knowledge circulation. I argue that that is what 'world literature' *is*—a nationalist project that attempts at globalism but is in fact always reflective of and engaged with national aims (even and especially when those aims are to present the national image as one deeply enmeshed in an international community capable of varying

cosmopolitanisms). By dismantling the overarching umbrella of *Arabian Nights* into its distinct editions, translations, adaptations, and eruptions over the course of its very long history we begin to re-understand how world literature functions as both a national and imperial project.

The Remaking of a Text

For the purposes of this chapter, I draw a distinction between *Arabian Nights*—the title I will use to refer to the European, specifically English, translations and adaptations of *Nights*—and *1001 Nights*, the title I use to refer to its Arabic source material. *'Nights'* will be used to refer to both iterations collectively.

Much of the scholarship around *Nights,* including and especially scholarship about Sir Richard Francis Burton's *Arabian Nights* focuses on transmission, its internal structure and what the structure of the source texts and translation might reveal. I shift focus instead to the methodology behind its textual criticism and translation in the nineteenth century: philology. The purpose of diving into the philological methods employed by scholars in the nineteenth century broadly and on *Arabian Nights* in particular are to help frame the ways in which these methodologies persist in reading practices and evaluations of 'authenticity.' Furthermore, I argue that these reading practices and methodologies also shape how we frame 'world literature' and that by interrogating them we can re-examine *what* world literature is and how it can be deployed to generate new understandings of old texts.

In her chapter "Reading Backward: The *1001 Nights* and Philological Practice", Karla Mallette traces out several nineteenth century philological practices as they pertain to *Nights*. Among these, I focus on the Lachmann method since, as we will later see, it is the methodology that had the most impact on *Nights.* The Lachmannian method was "a strategy pioneered in the

nineteenth century for reconstructing a literary text produced in a manuscript environment." (101) In order to "negotiate manuscript variance" a scholar begins by constructing a history of transmission or a "family tree or genealogy of the text as it has come down to us in its existing manuscript copies." The goal of such a reconstruction is to produce the most *authentic* and *complete* copy of a text rather than the oldest. This means that in the genealogical tree of a manuscript a later printed edition may take precedence over an earlier 'corrupted' manuscript--the disappearance of the manuscript on which the edition it was based on matters little. Of this process of textual transmission, Helmut Müller-Sievers writes, "Lachmann and his school…[radically rejected] the notion of a *textus receptus*, of a text that is tacitly accepted and immune to emendation" (167). The process, Lachmann believed, needed to be as "mechanical" as possible. This was, in part, an effort to transform philology into an academic science that could be then taught in universities. Instilling rigor meant doing away with forms of conjecture in textual reconstruction and allying the practice of philology of with the emerging science and scientific processes as closely as possible. Of current scholarship's reliance on Burton's *Arabian Nights*, Mallette writes that it "implies a judgment about the polyvalence of the text that has sweeping implications. Such a reading assumes a robust Lachmannian understanding of the polygenesis of the text, its constitution across cultural boundaries. The frame story of the *Nights*, the story of Scheherazade, celebrates narrative as a means to correct aberrant governance—both political and psychological—and to achieve civic justice. The padded version of the text, which accepts western interpolations as integral parts of the *1001 Nights* traditions, may be understood to support this thesis, if indeed it has a thematic unity at all" (106). Indeed, much of the scholarship about and around *Arabian Nights* resists various or alternate readings of Burton's text. Many an article finds space to respond to Muhsin Mahdi's forward to the 1990 edition of

his translation of the oldest Syrian manuscript, challenging Mahdi's argument that *Nights* scholarship should or must be truncated to the Syrian manuscript alone. The Lachmannian method arose in response to other philological practices, which there is little space in this chapter to discuss.[1] But what is relevant and important is that it arose as a method of textual criticism and excavation for medieval texts and its challenge or interrogation can serve as a useful theoretical fulcrum for this project.

The Lachmannian method reveals many assumptions, but perhaps most important that the coalescing of a text might be similar (or certainly similar enough that the differences cease to matter) across cultural boundaries and that the use of the manuscript not differ from place to place. It assumes, rather importantly, a global network of relations that make those similarities possible, which then begs the question: if *Nights* textual history or positioning is such that the Lachmannian method might apply, then why separate the study of medieval Britain from medieval Abbasid Baghdad? And what happens when you bring that assumption to bear on many of the texts evoking medieval English history separate from but alongside *Arabian Nights*? The purpose of this project is to interrogate the methodology of textual criticisms and the way it reflects and shapes not only translations but also reading practices. I am not interested in condemning Burton or the Lachmannian method (though I have reservations about both). In many ways, I'm not proposing anything new at all: what I *do* propose and argue for is a reconfiguration of our understanding of how these genres operate and how the nineteenth-century scholarly desire to make one out of many—exemplified in Burton—can become a generative space for thinking through how world literature actually functions and the ways its

[1] For a full discussion, see "Reading Evidence: Textual Criticism as Science in the Nineteenth Century", Helmut Müller-Sievers, *The Germanic Review*, 76.2, Spring 2001

investments are inescapable. In that way, Burton is not a *central* figure, but is the most final, most recent, and therefore the one with the most longevity. In order to understand just *how many* texts Burton and many other translators drew on and how large and sprawling the genealogical textual tree *was* the next section will focus transcription history of *1001 Nights* and later the translation and assembling history of *Arabian Nights*.

History of *The Thousand and One Nights/Arabian Nights' Entertainment*

The Textual Collation History of 1001 Nights

Despite the uncertainty around its exact point of origin, *Arabian Nights* clearly circulated in various forms prior to the tenth century, when it is cited by two historians: al-Mas'udi and Ibn Nadim. From them, we know these collections by name—an Arabic collection called *The Thousand Tales* or *The Thousand Nights* which was a translation of a Persian collection called *Hazar Afsana* (*A Thousand Legends*). Both of these collections have been lost, and it is unclear if further iterations retained the original tales or if they simply kept the name and general structure—frame stories told by a queen staying her own execution by her king—as well as the two main characters. These aspects passed to at least one collection: *The Thousand and One Nights*.

That collection—*The Thousand and One Nights*—and its stories remained in circulation until the latter half of the thirteenth century, when they were all written down in a definitive form during the Mamluk reign. They were transcribed either in Egypt or Syria and were later lost, but not before they were copied down again a generation or two later in a manuscript that was also later lost but that would form the basis for the surviving manuscripts we know today. The similarities in "substance, form, and style among the various early copies…point to a common

origin." (Haddawy, xiv) From this sprang two branches of the *1001 Nights* editions: the Syrian and the Egyptian.

From the Syrian branch we have four surviving manuscripts. The first and eldest was penned sometime during the fourteenth century and is the closest to the original. It exists in three volumes and is held in the French Bibliothèque Nationale. This manuscript is the basis for what comes to be known as the Calcutta I edition, which was published in 1814. The remaining three copies are later, and were copied in the sixteenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. All four carry the same core stories and "substance, form, and style". The Syrian branch is also the branch Muhsin Mahdi (and Hussain Haddawy, Mahdi's English-language translator) refer to as the 'original' *1001 Nights*, a designation that provokes varied reactions and that I will return to later in this section.

Conversely, of the Egyptian branch, Haddawy writes:

> "… [it] shows a proliferation that produced an abundance of poisonous fruits that proved almost fatal to the original. First, there exists a plethora of Egyptian copies all of which, except for one written in the seventeenth century, are late, dating between the second part of the eighteenth and the first part of the nineteenth century. Second, these copies delete or modify passages that exist in the Syrian manuscripts, add others, and indiscriminately borrow from each other. Third, the copyists, driven to complete one thousand and one nights, kept adding folk tales, fables, and anecdotes from Indian, Persian, and Turkish, as well as indigenous sources, both from the oral and from the written traditions. One such example is the story of Sindbad, which, though early in date, is a later addition. What emerged, of course, was a large, heterogeneous, indiscriminate collection of stories by different hands and from different sources, representing different layers of culture, literary

> conventions and styles tinged with the Ottoman cast of the time, a work very different from the fundamentally homogenous original, which was the clear expression of the life, culture, and literary style of a single historical moment, namely, the Mamluk period. This is the more significant because the Ottoman period is marked by a sharp decline in Arabic culture in general and literature in particular." (xvi)

This branch of editions spawned the Breslau, the Bulaq, and the Calcutta II editions. The Breslau was published between 1824 and 1838 in eight volumes. It was edited by Christian Maximillian Habicht, a Prussian, in collaboration with Mordecai ibn al-Najjar, a Tunisian. The manuscript relied on the Galland translation as well as a Tunisian manuscript which was later discovered to be a forgery by al-Najjar. The Bulaq manuscript followed in 1835. Edited by Abd al-Rahman al-Safti al-Sharqawi, the Bulaq is based on a late Egyptian manuscript and is notable because he attempted to fill the thousand and one nights. He did this by collecting both recent and old tales, as well as culling what he deemed unsophisticated and thereby transformed the Mamluk flavor of the manuscript. The Calcutta II followed, published between 1839 and 1842, by William Macnaughten. It had several editors, and its composition is based largely on an Egyptian manuscript from 1829, and "with interpolations and…'corrections'" using the Breslau and Calcutta I. The Calcutta II is notable because it has competed with the Bulaq in terms of authenticity and esteem among translators and scholars. As Haddawy writes, "'thoroughly edited' and 'completed,'… 'authentic' came to mean complete and ironically, spurious" (xvii).

The textual collation and translation history of the Egyptian branch is important because it represents a Lachmannian method of textual reconstruction. Furthermore, it made use of an earlier philological practice brought into circulation by Richard Bentley: conjecture. Müller-Sievers writes of the Bentley method, "conjectural philology believes that at least some of the

wounds inflicted on the manuscript in the history of transmission can be healed, and that conjecture can restore a text to a status "before" the time of its present manuscript. The judgment of the philologist, aided by the knowledge of the text and its subject matter, has greater weight than the manuscripts themselves" (165). In order to build a 'complete' manuscript of *1001 Nights*, editors filled in the blank spaces with early folklore and myth, and not all gap-filling was in the spurious vein of ibn al-Najjar. Many of these editions were guided by stringent philological principles and methodologies that nonetheless took no account of the cultural context of the original work. It seems that at no point in the transformation from *1001 Nights* to *Arabian Nights* was the question 'does the literature of its place of origin have a concern with 'completeness''? The methodology of producing a complete manuscript has somehow managed to completely elide what a manuscript's function might be in a medieval Arabic context and has instead burdened the manuscript with a nineteenth-century preoccupation with an 'end'. Nor do they consider the ways its lack of ending might be tied to its indeterminate authorship—the absence of which is quite a large strike against its inclusion in the Arabic literary canon.

Arabian Nights: A History of European Translation and Adaptation

If the Egyptian branch of the *1001 Nights* manuscripts is weighed down with an overabundance of fruit, then so too is the *Arabian Nights* by various European translations. Antoine Galland is credited with finding and introducing a manuscript of the *Arabian Nights* while stationed in Constantinople. In 1701 he published the Sinbad stories, and his success inspired him to publish *Les mille et une nuits*, a collection of tales partially based on the manuscript he'd discovered, partially based on stories told to him by Hanna Diab, a Syrian writer and storyteller. The collection was twelve volumes in all, published between 1704 and 1717.

Galland's *Nights* is notable not only because it was the first and sparked many more, and was extremely popular, but also because it is an *adaptation* rather than a translation, and would in turn become the basis for many *Arabic* manuscripts. Galland amended and culled entire stories from the manuscript, and indeed from Diab's own stories and imbued the collection with a distinctly French literary flair. Despite that, Galland saw his adaptation as a direct continuation of the oriental encyclopedia he published, the *Bibliothèque orientale*, "a work which stands at the beginning of orientalism, properly speaking…produced in an age when the Middle East was not perceived as being part of some underdeveloped Third World…" (Irwin, 15)

In the century following, many English grub street versions appeared translating Galland's adaptation. In 1811 Jonathan Scott produced a translation titled *Arabian Nights Entertainments* which provided the bases for bowdlerized and popularized English editions for children. In the early nineteenth century Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall discovered a manuscript in Cairo which contained the ending with which most *Nights* readers are familiar (Scheherazade presents the king with her children and asks for clemency for she has proven herself a loyal and faithful wife. Shahrayar issues her a reprieve and the threat of execution is ended). He worked on its translation between 1805 and 1806—the translation and the manuscript on which it was based were lost but a German translation of his French was published in 1825. Following that, Gustav Weil produced a translation published between 1837 and 1841 based on the Bulaq and Breslau texts, plus manuscripts in the Gotha library. This translation is notable because it excluded two literary Arabic genres: saj' (rhymed prose) and poetry. In 1838 Henry Torrens produced a partial translation of the Calcutta II but abandoned the pursuit when he realized Edward Lane was producing a translation of his own. He found the act of translating quite exceeded his skill in Arabic.

After his time in Cairo Edward William Lane published a book titled *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* in 1836 and released a revised edition in 1842. He meant his translation of *Arabian Nights* to be a continuation of that work—anthropological and ethnographic—and he based his translations on the Bulaq manuscript, publishing it in monthly parts between 1838 and 1841. Lane's edition is notable for both his omissions and his copious footnotes, both an attempt to render his translation of *Arabian Nights* an accurate rendering of life in modern Cairo. A difficult task, given that his source material was in circulation as early as the tenth century and by the time of his writing much had changed in the Arab and Islamic world. His translation was followed by a translation done by John Payne that circulated between 1882 and 1884 based on the Calcutta II with some tales from the Calcutta I and the Breslau. Payne was a known polyglot; by the time he was nineteen he had done translation of poetry in German, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Greek, Latin, Turkish, Persian, and Arabic. He enjoyed a number of literary friendships, among them Mallarmé and Swinburne. Two of his closest friendships were with Britain's leading experts and collectors of pornography, Foster Fitzgerald Arbuthnot and H.S. Ashbee (who specialized in Indian pornography and erotica). In translating his edition of *Nights* he received a great deal of help from Britain's leading orientalists, among them Sir Richard Francis Burton. His translation was published through a Villon's Society in order to avoid charges of obscenity with a circulation of five hundred subscribers.

Burton, who had helped Payne translate his edition a great deal, followed up with his own ten volume edition in 1885. Like Payne, he utilized the subscription model to avoid charges of obscenity and used his footnotes to set his own translation apart from Payne's. Altogether, his footnotes "add up to an encyclopaedia of curious sexual lore." (Irwin, 33) Here I want to turn to

two moments form Burton's translation of *Arabian Nights* in the cycle of stories known as "The Porter and the Three Ladies" which is one of the core cycles in the Syrian manuscript and features, among other characters, the caliph Haroun al-Rachid, and his minister Ja'far. In this tale, a porter is selected by a beautiful and wealthy woman to haul her groceries through Baghdad. At the end of the day he is welcomed into her home where she lives alone with two sisters. They are a salacious and ribald trio who ply the willing porter with good food and wine while engaging in sexual play with him. Haddawy translates the beginning of this episode thus:

> Thus receiving the full and returning the empty, they went on drinking cup after cup until the porter began to feel tipsy, lost his inhibitions, and was aroused. He danced and sang lyrics and ballads on with the girls, toying, kissing, biting, groping, rubbing, fingering, and playing jokes on them, while one girl thrust a morsel in his mouth, another flirted with him, another served him with some fresh herbs, and another fed him sweets until he was in utter bliss. They carried on until they got drunk and the wine turned their heads. (87-88)

Burton's translation on the other hand is written as:

> All this time the Porter was carrying on with them, kissing, toying, biting, handling, groping, fingering; whilst one thrust a dainty morsel in his mouth, and another slapped him; and this cuffed his cheeks, and that threw sweet flowers at him; and he was in the very paradise of pleasure, as though he were sitting in the seventh sphere among the Houris of Heaven. They ceased not doing after this fashion until the wine played tricks in their heads and worsted their wits… (89-90)

There are two things to note regarding the comparison of the two. First, Burton's is the much more florid translation in an attempt to elevate mundane and folkloric language into something more literary. The second is the extension and fixation on sexual play that for Burton becomes

intimately tied to religion. Haddawy doesn't shy from the sexual arousal nor, as we will see in a moment, from the verbal sexual play that continues. For Burton, sex and religion are intimately tied together so that the Porter's framing of his sexual euphoria is tied to paradise, and furthermore a specific religious aspect of a Muslim's understanding of paradise. Burton glosses the 'Houris of Heaven' with a footnote that reads:

> Arab. "Húr al-Ayn," lit. (maids) with eyes of lively white and black, applied to the virgins of Paradise who will wive with the happy Faithful. I retain our vulgar "Houri," warning the reader that it is a masc. for a fem. ("Huríyah") in Arab, although accepted in Persian, a genderless speech.

The mention of the 'vulgar "Houri"' may suggest that *houri* and *whore* are etymologically linked, though they are not. But more importantly it is a linguistic gloss rooted in a desire to methodologically link religion and sex in a way that plays to nineteenth-century cultural imaginaries around the seraglio and harem. It also heightens the presence of religion in a text that for a reader outside the cultural context for whom it was intended would miss all the ways in which *Nights* is already deeply enmeshed in religion.

This episode of sexual ribaldry continues with the sisters asking the Porter what their genitals are called, and as he gets increasingly vulgar the sisters become increasingly violent. The episodes ends in Haddawy's translation thus:

> At last, he turned to them and asked, "All right, what is its name?" The naked girl replied, "The basil of the bridges." The porter cried "The basil of the bridges! You should have told

me this from the beginning, oh, oh!" Then they passed the cup around and went on drinking for a while." (89)

Burton, on the other hand, translates as follows:

> At last he turned upon them asking, "And what do you women call this article?" Whereto the damsel made answer, "The basil of the bridges." Cried the Porter, "Thank Allah for my safety; aid me and be thou propitious, O basil of the bridges!" (91)

Again Burton's heavy handed florid writing is on full display, but more importantly this underscores the ways in which he imposes a particular vision of religiosity in the text that shores up both the ways nineteenth-century Victorians understood how religion permeated the lives of Muslims and the way that religiosity, in their view, was deeply tied to sex. Together his translation of this episode can be taken as commentary on Victorian views of sex more than an accurate representation of a medieval Baghdadi gathering. As Irwin notes, Burton was writing before many late nineteenth-century sexologists, and it is worth noting that in all likelihood many Victorian Christians would not have viewed their afterlife as something included the physical—certainly not something as physical as sex. The introduction of "houris" and the repeated referencing of a religion that already hangs over *Nights* unabashedly becomes recursive signaling of the translator, and not the translated text. To be sure, *1001 Nights* is unashamed of the sexuality displayed by its many characters. Burton's footnotes become a mechanism of re-centering a sexuality and libidinousness that was not incidental to the source text, but certainly not anything that it was afraid of.

Entering the Classical Arabic Canon

The purpose of sketching out the history of both *transcription* of the various Arabic manuscripts and the *translation* of their European (largely English and French) counterparts is to demonstrate the ways in which much of the Egyptian branch of the Arabic manuscripts developed *alongside* the European fascination with *1001 Nights* and its translation. And even as the two developed side by side, they are in many ways completely apart. The Egyptian branch and all its proliferation in no way engage with the origin point of the text. This history also highlights the ways its purpose in a European context diverged largely from its original intent. The *Arabian Nights Entertainments* has stood in as anthropological and ethnographic text for nineteenth-century Egyptians as well as an artifact of pornography and erotica. Lane and Burton both approached their translations of the manuscripts they chose as an opportunity to provide accurate and scholarly framings of parts of the world their readers would never go to. Even Galland viewed his adaptation of *Nights* as a scholarly continuation of the orientalist work he'd done on the *Bibliothèque orientale*. The history of adaptation, translation, and of its *editors'* purpose in translating, curating, and adapting editions of *Arabian Nights* is one deeply tied up with how scholarship frames and approaches world literature.

In her chapter "Translation in the Contact Zone" Madeline Dobie writes, "…Irwin observes that having noted that Galland mistakenly approached the *Nights* as a book by a single author, rather than as a ramified corpus, Mahdi proceeds to make a similar error by using the methods of classical philology to reconstruct the manuscript history of a work derived from folk traditions and oral sources. As Irwin notes, the emphasis that Mahdi places on recovering an authentic Arabic source also effectively renders every Arabic manuscript or printed work produced after Galland's translation inauthentic and essentially irrelevant" (37). Dobie and Irwin's rendering of Mahdi's views on the Egyptian branch of the *Nights* transcriptions is

accurate—at one point in his preface he refers to the various editions as "poisonous fruits" (xiv). There are eleven core stories in the Syrian manuscript, as well as the beginning of a story titled "Qamar al-Zaman." My primary aim in sketching out the history is to propose a middle ground between Dobie and Irwin's anxiety's around cutting off the Egyptian branch entirely from the history of the medieval text of *1001 Nights* and Mahdi's understandable desire to preserve some version of authenticity and locus of origin for the Syrian manuscript. The preoccupation with the legitimacy or authenticity of the Egyptian branch in *Arabian Nights* scholarship highlights a particular anxiety around the various manifestations of the text. The Egyptian branch, as pointed out earlier, developed much later than the Syrian and oftentimes in parallel to its European adaptations and translations. There was, in fact, such a mania for more stories and for presenting a 'complete' *Thousand and One Nights* that forgeries like ibn al-Najjar's were not out of character or strange. In fact, between 1805 and 1808 several Syrians presented more complete manuscripts that allegedly originated in Baghdad and were later found to be translations from French *into* Arabic of Galland's adaptation.

Nights scholarship evinces the desire to turn the history of the tales into a continuous one, to suggest that the differing contexts between the Syrian and Egyptian branches are irrelevant. Nowhere in Dobie's chapter or in Irwin's *Companion* which she references do either dip into the genre history of the fourteenth century manuscript. To scholars, its transcription history matters, as do its varying source materials and its cosmopolitan nature, but its status and the circumstances under which it was formed do not figure in that same literary scholarship. There are two mentions of *1001 Nights* in the tenth century that shed some light on its reception. They come from a summary by al-Mas'udi in *Meadows of Gold* that tell us how it ends and a rather scathing observation by ibn al-Nadim in his book *Fihrist*. He writes, "I have had the chance to

see this book in its complete form: to tell the truth, it is a very poor book that narrates coldly." (trans. Kilito,122) Such a summation should come as little surprise to anyone familiar with the glittering Arabic-language literary landscape. One that produced poetry, histories, rhymed prose, and genres we do not have in the English language, a landscape that leaves little room for *1001 Nights*, steeped as it is folklore and orality. The closer one observes medieval Arabic literature, the less wonder it is that *1001 Nights* was largely ignored by the critics of its day. Simply put, it was not "literature" according to the rules of the classical Arabic canon.

In the chapter entitled "Is *A Thousand and One Nights* a Boring Book?" Kilito argues that *Arabian Nights* never truly existed within the classical Arabic literary tradition and that in fact it did not even qualify as leisurely reading material. He writes, "[t]he Arabic literary tradition would still be the same if the *Nights* had never existed, whereas its landscape would obviously look different without the *Mu'allaqāt* (The suspended poems), for example, those famous "suspended" odes, or without the *maqāmāt* (assemblies)." It is, in fact, cited regularly "alongside other works of indeterminate status." The *Nights* appears on no timelines, under no canon headings, and fails all the general requirements for a title to make it on to the lists of classical Arabic literature. It has no author which, from a cultural perspective, makes the text an aberration, a necessity and quality that Kilito argues has its roots in the "critical methods that have accompanied the compilation of the Prophet's sayings (hadith). Just as there are works devoted to the transmitters of these sayings, there are others concerning literary figures, biographies that collect the maximum amount of information related to them—their date of birth and (especially) the date of their death, details about their careers, anecdotes that focus on their image, extracts from their works, judgments by their contemporaries, and reflections on the controversies they may have provoked" (119). Without an author it is also unmoored out of

time—the earliest mentions, as noted earlier, were in the tenth century, but many of the tales in its cycle are older still. The text has no provenance and therefore suffers in value.

This quality in turn produces another pressure—that the text be presented in a fixed form. That it be *written down*—not all texts achieved this. Kilito provides the example of al-Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* which exists in varying forms of completion likely because the author died before he could render it final. Canonical texts are also marked by "noble, imposing style", marked by its opaqueness and resistance to translation. Kilito writes that Arabic texts do not, "lend [themselves] well to translation; a version in a foreign language is beyond its horizons. Al-Jāhiz's *Kitāb al-hayawān* (Book of animals) affirms that poetry is restive in transmission: in a new language it loses its principal constituent, the nazm or metrical structure, and emerges as a web of banalities. It is only in the original language that the poem is identifiable as such to itself; it cannot be translated or, at least in principle, should not be. Al-Jāhiz does not explicitly express this interdiction, but it logically emerges from his comments. We can even go so far as to say that many texts in prose (*Risālat al-ghufrān*, for example, and al-Harīrī's *Maqāmāt*) are weakened and compromised in translation. One might object to such a statement by noting that everything depends on the quality of the translator. However, that is not the question. What I am trying to stress concerns the attitude of classic authors regarding the translation of their works: they were completely unaware of the possibility (whereas today it is the principal concern of Arab writers)" (121). I present the attitude regarding the translation of medieval Arabic texts by their authors and critics to highlight the ways in which the very mode and language of *1001 Nights* preclude it from being a part of the high and classical canon of Arabic literature. Much like the philological methodologies that relied on rigor, the manner by which texts were selected for longevity and culture were rigorous and *1001 Nights* does not bear up under them.

It is under this burden of requirements that ibn al-Nadim's comment is made and that *1001 Nights* disappears. No author for it may be found, the language is vulgar and simple, and it is not an object of instruction. It is these qualities that both mark it as obscure and also make it possible to extract from the Arabic literary milieu—whether high or low—and reposition it as a part of the world literature canon in a way that strips it of its cultural and historical specificity. This repositioning questions its lack of popularity in the Arabic language canon while also bestowing on it a literary elevation without ever considering the circumstances of its production. The existence of the 2008 Penguin edition of the *Arabian Nights* which purports to contain every tale of the *1001 Nights* regardless of date or point of origin underscores this positioning. The context within which *1001 Nights* was conceived—an oral tradition of folk tales instead of a manuscript with any literary esteem—is erased or ignored and instead scholarly discussions are rooted in its philology, translation and adaptation history. Scholars foreground their anxiety about how the Egyptian branch, on which most Romance language translations are based, should be counted as equally authentic as the Syrian, part of a larger sprawling whole. There is a resistance to admitting or acknowledging the mechanics by which this cultural move to elevate a text from another culture is possible and by which that move *remains* possible, a desire to locate an author where there is none, to understand why the Arabs did not prize the collection the way it was prized among Europeans when they encountered it.

Dobie and Irwin's reaction to Mahdi's categorical dismissal of the Egyptian branch and the circumstances of its growth are rooted in this and in doing so misunderstands his apprehension. The inauthenticity of which he speaks and the authenticity he pursues in his edition of *1001 Nights* has everything to do with re-inscribing its context onto the manuscript and separating it from a series of texts that sprung up far away from the fourteenth century

Mamluk domain of the Syrian manuscript. Putting aside the question of genre and status, the historical and cultural concerns of the text are entirely alien to its Egyptian successors. They express "the life, culture, and literary style of a specific historical moment" during the Mamluk period (Mahdi, xi). Embedded in this historical moment is nostalgia for the Golden Age of Islam—the time of Harun al-Rachid. The stories are meant for performance in a culture that still valued the oral tradition even as their literary landscape grew and expanded. Karla Mallette further argues that the understanding of *Arabian Nights* and preceding that *1001 Nights* in the western canon as a story *about* stories and the power of narrative is a western imposition. When resituated within its cultural source and context, several notes begin to emerge. First, that it is a nostalgic text fixated on the 'Golden Age' of Islam in the city of Baghdad under the rule of Harun al-Rachid. In the Syrian *1001 Nights* there are nine cycles and Harun al-Rachid figures large, as does his vizier Ja'far. For Mallette, Harun and Ja'far's presence is not neutral or incidental, but in fact gesture to the great conspiracy that saw Ja'far and every member of his clan—the Barmakids—dead. For Mallette, Scheherazade becomes not a political intercessor who wields the power of stories, but a sharp echo of the harem women who engineered the Barmakids's demise through whispers and intrigue. It is a very different reading than the traditional understanding linked to *Arabian Nights*—one that becomes obfuscated by the sheer *sprawl* of *Arabian Nights* and its many additions. And while I am not entirely convinced that Scheherazade functions as a stand in for Harun's wife and the part she played in Ja'far's demise, it is a reading that is embedded in the cultural knowledge of a fourteenth-century Mamluk reader. As such, it provides a glimpse of how a very different *Nights* from the one that circulates within the canons of world literature, might function.

In contrast to this culturally and historically situated manuscript, the Egyptian manuscripts were not only much younger but also produced in response to a rising demand for more stories. Galland's introduction of *Arabian Nights* to a European audience demanded not only more tales, but more nights—the Galland adaptation contained just under three hundred nights—and a *complete* form. Furthermore, they were produced for an audience that would read them silently, not one that would read them aloud, one unfamiliar with the customs and style of their place of origin, and ignorant of the particular histories to which the stories make reference. In his opening chapter of *Companion* to *Nights* Irwin touts William Beckford's *Vathek* as the most accurate representation of the East and Islam of its contemporaries, then later clarifies that while that may be true, the bar was quite low as accuracy was hard to find in the exotic oriental tales of the time. It is into this literary milieu that the Egyptian manuscripts enter and are translated. Lane and Burton's attempts to bring to readers translations that would clarify the origin of the stories, their cultural framing and so on only succeeded in distorting the original and attempted to create a bridge to a world that hadn't existed since the fourteenth century.

By all accounts, most if not all of the translators had some understanding of the literary landscape into which *1001 Nights* was brought into existence or collected. Despite that, despite the evident rigor that dictated it not be included in the canon, they worked hard to reframe it as a text worthy of study. And part of that work included shifting their focus to the Egyptian manuscript and its various offspring since much of it was produced with a Western reader in mind and in that way likely fit their agendas better. Unlike the Syrian manuscript, the Egyptian manuscript need not necessarily be 'unmoored' from its history as the editors, collectors, and those who produced new fictions to fit within its scope, have done some of that work already.

The Difficulty of Language

In addition to its complicated transcription and transmission history is, of course, the sheer difficulty of medieval Arabic. Even without the opaque style Kilito describes regarding the more highly regarded texts, medieval Arabic presents its own unique set of problems. Most medieval manuscripts lack the diacritics used to differentiate several letters from each other, and a word can change from one meaning to another depending on the vowel markings it bears. Without those, a translator is left to make educated guesses based on their own knowledge and the context of what it is they translate. Many eighteenth- and nineteenth-century translators demonstrate an admirable command of the language. Haddawy writes that "a careful comparison between any given Arabic passage and their own respective translation reveals an admirable command of Arabic" (xx). And yet authenticity does not flow from accuracy. The following quote from Haddawy's introduction to his translation of Mahdi's edition of *Arabian Nights* gets to the heart of the matter.

> In syntax, reordering the clauses for a coherent reading often requires knowledge of Arab life and culture. For example, the following passage, translated literally reads:
>
> > After a whole, our mother also died, and left us three thousand dinars, which we divided equally among ourselves. I was the youngest. My two sisters prepared their dowries and got married.
>
> Burton translates it as follows:

> After a while my mother also deceased, leaving me and my sisters-german three thousand dinars; so each daughter received her portion of a thousand dinars and I the same, albe' the youngest. In due course of time, my sisters were married with the usual festivities.

Haddawy continues:

> But it should read:
>
> > After a while, our mother also died, leaving us three thousand dinars, which we divided equally among ourselves. Since was the youngest of the three, my two sisters prepared their dowries and got married before me.
>
> For what is at issue here is not the Islamic law of inheritance but marriage customs in Arab society.

Burton specifically extols the manner in which he has been embedded in various Arab and 'Mohammaden' cultures, citing among many things his visit to Mecca and Medina as proof of unique insight he can offer into the historical and cultural realities contained within the text. And indeed, his readers and colleagues took this as both proof and part of the *methodology* of philology touted by Richard Bentley in the nineteenth century. "Total immersion," Müller-Sievers writes, "in the linguistic and cultural environment is the precondition for any conjecture; the philologist must merge with "his" author so that he can deduce what must have filled the

lacunae inflicted by history" (166). In this instance, that lacunae extends to meaning. His facility with language only takes him so far and, as Haddawy highlights, often reveals large blind spots. His mode of translation alone points to an individual who has fundamentally misunderstood the place the text has within the constellation of Arabic literature. The overly florid and archaic language he uses in his translation is meant to evoke both the age and the nature of the original Arabic when the fact of the matter is that for the most part—excluding the Bulaq which was edited by an Arab editor who sought to elevate it from its mundane language—the *Nights* is written in a simple and colloquial style. The shortcomings of Burton's translation then are twofold; he fundamentally misunderstands both the cultural situation of the events in *Nights* as well as the place that opaque language has within the classical Arabic literary schema.

In this context, Dobie and Irwin's resistance to labeling the Egyptian branch of manuscript and the translations based on that branch as irrelevant or inauthentic belies a refusal to engage with *how* colonial and power dynamics have shifted, thereby reconfiguring the framework of translation and the positioning of *Arabian Nights*. The history of production, consumption, reception, and translation suggest a lack of authenticity only if one reads and judges the younger Egyptian manuscripts and their offshoots by the same standards one would use in reading and judging the elder Syrian. The Egyptian manuscript exists almost entirely outside that system; it isn't governed by the expectations of even low medieval Arabic literary culture. Instead, it participates in a literary landscape that is global in scope, that expects translation in a way medieval Arabic texts would not have as mentioned previously. This points to not only a shift in colonial and imperial power dynamics but the emergence of a nationalized world literature. What I mean by this is that instead of being a stand in for any *reality* of medieval Arabic literary culture it instead becomes a part of an imperial map, figuring as a very

specific window or shorthand for another part of the world. It is an imperial curio that sketches the horizons of past and present for readers at home rather than being situated in the circumstances that shaped its first production. The Egyptian manuscript and its offshoots are not less authentic by this barometer, but like the Arthurian tradition in Britain evolved to serve different needs in a different global context.

I am less interested in drawing actual comparisons between translation as a methodology of condemnation or tracing failure. Rather, in thinking through the difficulty of language and the obstacles it posed both for the translator and reader, it becomes a site for generative methodology. If pushed, I would say the Burton translation *is* a failure, but many scholars disagree. But to close the door on Burton's translation is to also ignore the multiple ways it is embedded in the English literary landscape and thereby lose what reading it alongside and in dialogue with similar English literary projects focused in *English* medieval history might yield to us as scholars.

Irwin makes the argument that neither Lane nor Burton's intent was to harm. Burton especially, according to Irwin, was not invested in an imperial agenda and resented the machinations of empire that regularly left him impoverished and on the outside. And while this may be true, Irwin uses Burton's suspicion and dislike of empire as a shield against the criticisms that his text rightfully elicits. The ever-present scholarly anxiety about the possibilities of invalidating the Egyptian branch and the translations and adaptations it spawned rears its head in his reading and interaction with Burton's *Arabian Nights*. But there are several things worth noting both about Burton *and* Edward Lane's translations that are worth interrogating in this project. The cultural frame through which he and Lane viewed *Arabian Nights* as evidenced by

their footnotes are bewildering ones. Lane's reframing of the stories as a window through which a reader might view nineteenth-century life among the Egyptians is undermined both by the amount of material he needed to excise in order to make the two align, and then again by the effort necessary in the footnotes to justify that forced alignment. Burton for his part has a different aim: "Explanatory notes did not enter into Mr. Payne's plan. They do with mine: I can hardly imagine *The Nights being read to any profit by men of the West without commentary. My annotations avoid only one subject, parallels of European folklore and fabliaux which, however interesting, would overswell the bulk whose specialty is anthropology.*" (Emphasis mine.) Though Irwin makes much of the way Burton's footnotes represented his racist fascination with the sexual practices of the East (Burton imagined them to be wildly and remarkably different than European sexual practices), for the purposes of this project they represent something much more interesting. Burton's footnotes allow the reader to see the ways he envisioned *Arabian Nights* as part of a broader, international literary conversation. Rather than being hitched to a specific historical and cultural moment he imagined *Arabian Nights* as part of a 'world literature'. The demystifications he commits to for the 'man of the West' seem less like demystifications and more an attempt to trace a wide and elaborate map—both literal and figurative—of references. And though he avoids (to some extent) "parallels of European folklore and fabliaux" the links and connections he *does* make are often European medieval ones. Among the references in his footnotes are John Mandeville, Queen Margaret of Navarre, and Shakespeare. All made in an attempt to clarify what he deems as moments obscure or too culturally removed from his audience to make sense to them.

The aim, then, when considering the history of *1001 Nights* and *Arabian Nights* broadly, and Burton's translation of it in particular is to consider *how Arabian Nights* becomes culturally

situated through the act of translation and adaptation and following that what that cultural positioning can reveal to us, as scholars, about world literature broadly and about nineteenth-century medieval revivalist literature in particular.

Arabian Nights and World Literature

In their introduction to *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context* Makdisi and Nausbaum write that "The publication of Antoine Galland's French edition of *Les Mille et une nuits* in the early eighteenth century seemed to stabilize what continues to be a notoriously unstable text; to normalize it into a single and at least momentarily definitive edition" (3). It seems to me that stabilization could be read another way—imposition. There are countless reasons for why *1001 Nights* did not survive the fourteenth century in a complete and definitive form, among them its status and the value—or lack thereof—placed on it by virtue of the fact that it was born out of an oral tradition and therefore inherently unstable. In his book *Arabic Literary Salons in the Islamic Middle Ages* Samer M. Ali argues against the divide theory; that is, the theory that when print culture arises in a society that the oral traditions die out. Arab medieval culture challenges this—even as print culture rose a culture of orality persisted in literary salons and in the marketplaces. Mahdi and Haddawy's argument for an 'original' manuscript that was likely an aid in oral performance bear this out. The 'instability' that scholars and editors have fought in the text may in fact simply be a part of its nature, as the expectation of a performer was to make whatever they read or performed their own.

The stability that Makdisi and Nausbaum cite then becomes an imposition of literary and cultural value. Unsurprising, considering that Galland's translation was in truth an adaptation that morphed the text on which it was based into a French literary artifact, easily consumable by

his core audience. That and his view of it as a text that was meant to continue the work he began in the *Bibliothèque orientale* transforms an unstable text rooted in a medieval Arabic oral literary tradition into a clearly defined and delimited European literary artifact. It becomes, rather than being constituted of its own culture and history, one of Damrosch's windows. Here is where the text moves through the permeable/impermeable border and where it transforms from one thing to another. This is not to suggest that in crossing that border and being subject to that transformation that it can be entirely uncoupled from its place of origin. Instead, I want to suggest that that crossing is a place of tension—we should never forget from where a text comes or the mechanisms by which that displacement has been made possible. There is an inclination, certainly, to minimize the effects of this displacement since it occurred in a time when France and much of Europe in fact were not colonial powers. But the *legacy* of that displacement lasted long into the rise of European powers and became embedded in their power structures. We did not arrive suddenly and surprisingly at a translation in the nineteenth century; a series of foundations were laid borne out by early attitudes around translation and nation building that then contributed to the historiography that shaped *Arabian Nights* both as a philological and anthropological text.

It would be incorrect however to assume that *Les mille et une nuits* is solely responsible for the rising mania for the Orient in France and England. Irwin writes that around seven hundred romances were published in the oriental mode and among there authors were Guellette, Hamilton, and Crébillon. "The translations of Sir William Jones (1746-96) from Hindu, Persian, and Arabic classics were widely read. The travel narratives of Chardin, Tavernier, Tournefort, Sherley, and Bernier were also popular. The commercial and military ventures of Britain and France in India stimulated an interest in Indo-Muslim culture. Towards the very end of the

century, in 1798, Bonaparte and the French landed in Egypt, and, as Edward Said remarks, this 'invasion was in many ways the very model of a truly scientific appropriation of one culture by another'" (242). William Beckford's *Vathek,* which was published in 1782, circulated as an authentic oriental tale. But Beckford's Arabic was mediocre at best, and most of his knowledge of the Islamic culture seems to have come via Galland. In an attempt to make it appear authentic and original, Beckford's assistant, Henley, glossed the manuscript with a series of footnotes which started a fashion of annotating oriental fictions that was later reproduced by Southey in *Thalaba*, and Moore in *Lalla Rookh*. "*Vathek* was the most richly realized of all oriental tales to appear in English or French up to that date and the most accurate in its details about life in the Islamic lands. Even so, it was not very accurate, and much of the erudition suggested by the footnotes was rather bogus. The work almost certainly owes more to pseudo-oriental fictions in English and French than to Arabic sources" (252).

It is into this literary milieu that later English translations and adaptations enter. Burton's resorting to footnotes served a number of purposes: it lent his translation a level of authenticity and academic rigor and put it in line with a series of other texts that had done the same. Burton's footnotes also show an extraordinary focus on sex and the erotic as it was represented—or as he saw that representation—in Indo-Muslim culture. But more than that, the footnotes demonstrate that Burton saw his translation of *Arabian Nights* to be in conversation not only with medieval texts concurrent with its discovery in Syria or Egypt, but the world over. I have mentioned how scholarship treats *Arabian Nights* as a closed loop text. That is, that for the main part, scholarship is focused on its internal structure and in how it relates to itself. It is related to the oriental fictions and yet apart from it because it isn't a fabricated translation. For this project, Burton's footnotes represent a way out of this closed loop. His use of them to draw a broad global map of

references allows us to think through *how* embedded *Arabian Nights* is with nineteenth-century English literature, beyond the usual 'it was the most well-read text second only to the Bible.' In what ways is not only its *structure* but its *material* present and engaged with English literature. Most crucially, the medieval literary and historical references Burton makes allow us to build bridges to other medieval revivalist texts and the ways in which *Arabian Nights*—a medieval text invested in nation building and nostalgia—engages and elicits responses from medieval revival texts of the nineteenth century doing similar work. It is useful and generative to consider the ways in which these translations contributed to racial, imperial, and colonial discourse with other oriental texts. But in the vein of world literature, and in the spirit of Damrosch's "two windows" it is equally generative to excavate the ways in which one of the most read texts in the nineteenth century engaged with and was *reflective of* the host values cultures and their views of themselves. Burton's footnotes themselves demonstrate it. He sketches for the reader a staggering amount of information, not always relevant and often times in an attempt to separate himself from previous translations (he takes quite a few shots at Edward Lane). However, from his footnotes emerge a global network of information—in one footnote alone he references Hindu, Hebrew, Chaldean, and Russian folklore in an attempt to clarify what an ogress is. (55) In another, he references the travel writings of Sir John Mandeville to clarify a medieval Egyptian custom of which he had proof. (77) And in yet another he connects the misdeed of a woman to the medieval Queen Margaret of Navarre. (73) The origin of the text is not what makes it global for Burton or for his readers but the ways in which they can spin threads to connect it to places both at home and abroad. Irwin uses the racist vernacular of the blackamoor's speech in "The Tale of the Ensorcelled Prince" to highlight both the ways in which Burton slips up in translating and his racism rooted in beliefs about sex and race. The moment in which he speaks in a racist

approximation of a nineteenth-century American slave also highlights the ways in which the text is turned toward Britain and expresses both Burton's personal and a national concern with race.

Both the footnotes in *Arabian Nights Entertainments* and Burton's translation of the text itself demonstrate an awareness of the ways in which it fits into a nineteenth century constellation of discourses and literature. In the same way that Montesquieu's *Persian Letters* (1721) are more about French domestic and national concerns than they are about an accurate or engaged window into life in a Persian seraglio, Burton's translation reveal sexual and domestic anxieties and concerns more at home in nineteenth-century Britain than anything that might have concerned a fourteenth-century Mamluk listener or reader. As many scholars have noted, the touch of these tales can be seen all over the Anglophone literary landscape, though not simply the marvelous or the strange. Western audiences' fascination with the tales was not only exoticism and oriental mania but that it also dealt with questions of sovereignty and womanhood during a time when Britain's sovereign was a queen.

The intent in selecting *Ivanhoe* (1819) and *Idylls of the King* (1859) instead of nineteenth-century texts which make open reference to *Arabian Nights* is to trace how *Nights,* and its presence in the national imaginary impacted, shaped, and engaged with Victorian ideas about national history. Rather than plot out the appearance and mention of *Nights* in literature, I want to excavate distortions, refractions, and thematic links that signal a reconceptualization of national history that ignores or elides known contact zones and that might attempt to present those contact zones as quarantined. Both *Ivanhoe* and *Idylls of the* King also had enormous cultural impact and actively shaped how their audiences perceived the medieval past. To that end I turn to the presence of Al-Andalus on the periphery of Scott's imagined twelfth-century England and the heathens hovering on the borders of Arthurian Camelot. The figures selected

from *Arabian Nights*—Harun al-Rachid and Scheherazade respectively—have been selected as foils for a number of reasons. They both appear across all versions—from the Galland to the Lane to the Burton—as well as in the original Syrian manuscripts. They are also figures well known by the English reading public—Scheherazade became in many ways a stand-in for literary ingenuity and the power of story, and Harun al-Rachid appeared in, among other things, Alfred Tennysons's "Recollections of the Arabian Nights" (1830). The comparisons are not meant to suggest that Scott wrote Richard the Lionheart with Harun al-Rachid in mind or that Tennyson imagined Guinevere with Scheherazade hovering as a specter over her, but that the reception of these characters and the place they had in the national imaginary were in conversation with one another. One cannot think of figurations of English monarchy without defining it against oriental despotism, or of white womanhood and domesticity without imagining and invoking the threat the seraglio to both.

The tension at the center between the orientalist strain of criticism rooted in *Nights* and the criticisms surrounding burgeoning discourses around history, historical fiction, and historiography rooted in the medieval revival are linked. As *Nights* does the work for reimagining a past that persisted well into the future, so do these selected texts (among others) imagine pasts that produced an unbroken chain of history leading to the modern, imperial moment. The nature of scholarship is to cordon these strains apart—any discussion of *Arabian Nights* legacy in the West is intimately linked with oriental mania, the genres that sprung up in its wake, and so on. I argue that in segregating them we lose a crucial piece, the second window if you will, and the wider effect it had in framing and highlighting attitudes around the national self as it went out into the world to create empire.

Chapter Two: *Ivanhoe*, Richard Lionheart, and Haroun al-Rachid

The Shadow of the Crusades

This chapter takes up the theoretical and methodological scaffolding set up in the first chapter—of world literature as nation-facing rather than global-facing, and uses Sir Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe* as a case study, positioning it against *Arabian Nights* in an attempt to bridge the divide between well-entrenched nineteenth-century orientalism sketched out in the previous chapter and the nineteenth-century medieval revival. To tease out this chapter's questions, I focus on figurations of kingship, working from Haroun al-Rachid as he is represented in *Arabian Nights*, to Richard the Lionheart, his brother King John, and Robin of Locksley as they are represented in Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe* (1819). My focus on Haroun al-Rachid serves to position him as the specter of oriental despot-slash-king against which the king figures in Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe* may be engaging or defining themselves. Though the practice of medievalism in the Anglophone world in the nineteenth century rarely engages with the burgeoning fields of Orientalism, it nevertheless takes up the same historical work—refiguring the past to make sense of the present and future. In that sense, domestic and foreign figurations of kingship are implicitly in conversation, even as nineteenth-century historians shore up the divides and differences between them. In light of that this chapter will take up three kings in *Ivanhoe*—King John, Robin Hood (king of thieves), and King Richard the Lionheart and various figurations of kingship in relation to the specter of oriental despotism.

Oriental despotism has historically been inextricably linked from European imaginaries of governance both at home and abroad. In his article "Romantic Attitudes toward Oriental

Despotism" Chen Tzoref-Ashkenazi traces the transformation of political theories of despotism over the course of the late 1700s and into the 1800s as they were linked to Napoleon, the French Revolution, and theories of democracy at home as well as self-governance in the colonies. It was "one of the most influential ways of interpreting Asian society and politics in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries…" More importantly, it appealed to theorists and writers alike because "it was not an arbitrary concept imposed on Asian societies: it grew out of the interplay between travelers' observations and theoretical interpretations" (281). Because I am concerned with how historical imaginings of a medieval British past are linked to a broader global and specifically Oriental past, Oriental despotism as a political theory and a specter that haunts nineteenth-century imaginings of the medieval serves as a useful bridge for unearthing that enmeshment

I turn to Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe* for two reasons. First, this chapter and more broadly this project is invested in renditions of kingship at home; that is how does a historical Britain figure in the cultural imaginary and interact with translated works. It is for this reason I turn largely to *Ivanhoe*, with brief divergences to Scott's Crusade novel *The Talisman* (1825). Its importance to this chapter lies in the presence of the Saracen king Saladin and the ways in which it highlights a broader network of awareness that makes the separation of *Arabian Nights* from British medieval revival starker. Saladin is important not only because he is the Eastern figure most closely associated with Richard, being his foe in the Crusades. But also, because his appearance in *The Talisman* is not so dissimilar to Richard's in *Ivanhoe*, and in fact *very* similar to Haroun's—that is, he is a wandering king who goes among his people in disguise. Second, Walter Scott was fantastically well read—his view of literature both historical and contemporary was global in its scope and the depth of his knowledge is apparent in his writing. In the "Historical Note" to the Edinburgh Edition of *The Talisman* Ellis writes, "[it] would be possible to suggest a source for

almost every detail in *The Talisman*….This is evidence of the breadth and depth of the resources on which Scott was able to draw for materials to adopt and adapt. He had on his shelves at Abbotsford not only most of the relevant imaginative works of his time, written in the oriental *lingua franca* which their authors built up and absorbed from each other, but the overtly scholarly tomes and earlier material referred above. As Mark Girourd puts it, 'Scott's genius was based on almost inexhaustible creative energy, combined with remarkably wide reading and research'" (371). The 'earlier material' includes Weber's *Tales of the East* (1812) which was a two thousand double columned compendium of Eastern tales, Samuel Johnson's *Rasselas* (1759), Sheridan's *The History of Nourjahad* (1767), William Beckford's *Vathek* (1786), Southey's *Thalaba* (1801), Byron's *The Giaour* and *The Bride of Abydos* (1813), *The* Corsair (1814), Thomas Moore's *Lalla Rookh* (1817), Thomas Hope's *Anastasius* (1819), and James Justinian Morier's *Hajji Baba* (1824) (Ellis, 370).

Furthermore, it's clear that Scott thought and engaged with questions of kingship and leadership both at home and in the East. By the time he wrote *The Talisman* in 1825 Saladin was a fixed chivalric and romantic figure in the West who often drew comparisons to his harsher, crueler European adversary Richard the Lionheart. But it's important that even in his sympathetic renderings of Saladin he is never shown ruling. Despite ruling an expanding empire that conquered Syria and Upper Mesopotamia, establishing a unified Muslim state and fighting the Crusades, Saladin has enough time to disguise himself as a physician and wander through the Christian camp offering help and advice. It is not difficult to come out as the more chivalric figure against a king who spent a cumulative six months of his monarchy in his home country as Richard did.

Because my project is invested in the creation of empire as it exists in the cultural imaginary it is useful to make a distinction between representations of despotism and empire. Despotism is not only racially charged, linked as it is with the orient, but a reflection of the type of ruler a person is. A despot is not only a tyrant but one who interacts with little or no apparatuses of government. They are surrounded by people who bend to their whim, who echo back what they are told, and who do not challenge their leader. They exist to serve his *desires* as they serve himself and not his orders as they would affect the kingdom and his subjects. Presumably, in these representations, the country, nation, or kingdom exists solely as source of wealth to fuel his lifestyle and not as a trust or responsibility that must be honored or nurtured. Conversely, an empire is a large bureaucratic machine and those who rule and run it must be thoughtful in order to be successful. Here care of an empire or nation's citizenry is not irrelevant, but the work and time required to make sure its apparatus runs smoothly stands in sharp contrast to the abundance of time Haroun al-Rachid has to wander the marketplace or Shahrayar has to listen to stories and kill wives. The distinction between them is one of character: despots are men of leisure and lazy by design, men of empire are not. Indeed, Tzoref-Ashkenazi emphasizes the ways in which British theories of Oriental despotism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were rooted in justification of imperial pursuits and denying colonial subjects self-rule. They were also in the nineteenth century, importantly, a way of religious and cultural delineation. Despotism became the marker of Asian empires—Ottoman, Persian and Mughal India, linked deeply to Islam.

Richard the Lion Heart's legacy as a battle-hardened warrior hero is evidenced quite clearly in *Ivanhoe* and it is inextricably bound up in the history of the crusades and following that, his rival Saladin. So much so that when Walter Scott returned to Richard as a character in

1825, he paired him with Saladin (who in some ways took on a role similar to his in *Ivanhoe*) during the crusades. As such Richard I's legacy as a king, too, is tied up in a world that *Ivanhoe* both elides and attempts to grapple with through the mentions of the crusades as well as through Rebecca and Isaac, the novel's Jewish characters, and their escape to Al-Andalus at the end of the novel. Rebecca and Isaac's presence threatens the homogenous religious and national identity the novel strives toward with its end of reconciliation between father and son, while the presence and mention of Al-Andalus pressures the representation of the East as a place of war and despotism.

Of the medieval Jewish presence in England Heng writes, "[t]he presence of a visible, economically active, yet unassimilated Jewish community in England living "cheek by jowl" with Christians (Stacey, 264)…must have been a troubling focus in the social culture that conduced to the rise of the medieval English nation…. Jews constituted a resident alien community *within* England itself, as England was consolidating as a nation: an alien community whose existence and daily activities were intimately bound up with the economic and social life of the dominant community, but from which, nonetheless, they necessarily remained apart, by virtue of fundamental differences of race-religion." (Heng, 84) And indeed we see this born out as King John relies on Isaac for fiscal support in order to prepare to challenge his brother and Wilfred too is indebted to Isaac for supplying horse and armor. The threat of these entanglements is easily allayed by the narrative—John doesn't get a chance to mount his armies and Wilfred is able to repay Isaac his debt. What is not so easily cast off the threat of *conversion* that haunts all interactions between Christians and Jews in medieval texts and that is brought back to life in this medieval imaginary.

As I will argue in the third chapter of this dissertation the threat of infection by the Other through religion is most often born by women in these narratives. Their bodies are penetrable and vulnerable and therefore deemed to be most often at risk. Rebecca is in many ways the inverse of that risk—she threatened national and religious identity by existing under the threat of penetration by a Christian, one who is thoroughly bewitched by her and consumed with his desire to possess her. It is telling that neither Bois-Guilbert considers converting to Judaism nor does he offer Rebecca the opportunity to convert to Christianity. As far as the narrative is concerned there is no way for them to exist together—even his suggestions that they escape, and she live as his mistress somewhere in the East are dismissed by Rebecca herself and never presented as a truly feasible option by the narrative. Scott's construction of English identity in *Ivanhoe* is such that the persistent medieval fear of conversion or of even crossing the race-religion line is impossible. And he resolves this conflict by death—Bois-Guilbert suffers a stroke and dies during trial by combat, thereby saving Rebecca and Wilfred's life. Rebecca is a foil to her father—gracious and generous where he is duplicitous and greedy. Her one-sided romance with Wilfred is a reflection of the manner in which this medieval imaginary of twelfth-century England cannot withstand a religious Other, no matter the ways that Rebecca evinces traditional white femininity.

Bois-Guilbert's death and Rebecca and Isaac's escape to Al-Andalus is the only narrative solution to both acknowledge the presence of a religious Other and maintain a homogenous national identity for England. But their escape to Al-Andalus also raises other concerns. It is a rare piece of English literature both medieval and Victorian that addresses or even represents the Eastern religious and racial Other as a community or society that self-governs. From Chaucer to Geoffrey of Monmouth to *The Song of Roland* and their various iterations and reimagining's—

fiction displays the East as either the site of Crusades or the harem, never the poetry salon or petitioning chamber. The migratory flow of Christians from East to West or vice versa comes through the crusade roads and not through any of the intellectual centers in Europe or the East that would have carried with them philosophical translations, courtly love poetry, or treatises on falconry and the like.

Scott's cursory mention of Al-Andalus and of Boabidil (who was in fact Abu `Abdallah Muhammad XII, the last sultan of Granada) are revealing ones for all their brevity. For in Boabdil's court and under his rule Isaac and Rebecca expect to be treated fairly and equally under the law, in a way that is impossible in England. Up until this point in *Ivanhoe* Scott's representation of Saracens have been the Templars black slaves who do not speak and over whom the specter of cannibalism hovers. They are in many ways the stock Moorish characters one expects in such a novel. Boabdil's presence on the periphery fractures that—the connection between East and West is not only war, but literature and intellect. And, more importantly, the religious Other is not abroad and outside of Christendom but pressing up against the border, facilitating easy migration on the European continent. And it is no accident that Scotts plucks Boabdil, the *last* sultan of Granada who surrenders the city to the Christians in the fifteenth century, rather than Richard I's contemporaries who, in the twelfth century, were still well entrenched in Muslim Iberia.

It is into this fracture that I want to introduce a reading of Haroun al-Rachid, a staggeringly large figure in the Islamic historical imagination and who figured quite largely in *Arabian Nights*. By reading Anglophone iterations of Haroun al-Rachid alongside Richard the Lionheart I tease out questions of governance and rule, both domestic and imperial, as they figure in the nineteenth-century cultural imagination.

Scholarship on the postcolonial medieval, the Victorian medieval revival, and Sir Walter Scott himself is wide and sprawling. I have discussed in the introduction the work of people like Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, Suzanne Conklin Akbari, and Maria Menacol whose scholarship draws critical connections between East and West to build a more nuanced map of the medieval literary past. To that I would add John M. Ganim who opens his book *Medievalism and Orientalism* with a reading of Salah al-Din as historically informed and fictionally imagined in *The Book of Saladin.* Much of this project owes its framing to his interrogation of "the idea of the Middle Ages" and its formation as a response to a European identity crisis which "rests on and reacts to an uncomfortable sense of instability about origins, about what the West is and where it came from. The definition of medieval culture, especially literature and architecture, from its earliest formulation in the Renaissance through to the twentieth century has been a site of a contest over the idea of the West, and by definition, that which is non-Western" (3). And in her book *Myth and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Britain: the Legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood* Stephanie L. Barczewski traces the ways in which nineteenth-century historians argue that while much of Europe consciously worked to build a national image based around the inheritance and ancientness of governance and existence, that Britain—which had historical texts proving its age—did not need to do so. She argues that, despite that, cultural and national identity was indeed shaped by myth consciously through literature and traces the rise and popularity of King Arthur and Robin Hood specifically.

For the purposes of this chapter it is useful to move away from the broad 'medieval revival' to the specific ways scholars have engaged with Scott's romances and historical fiction. Ian Duncan's *Scott's Shadow: The Novel in Romantic Edinburgh* (2007) tracks Sir Walter Scott's centrality in the rise and domination of Scottish publications in the English-language

literary market, and how his novels achieved critical acclaim, and a readership whose size was unmatched and unprecedented. And in his chapter "Crossing the Border with Walter Scott" *(*2016) Devin Griffith outlines how Scott's historical fiction uses analogies "between "living" and dead men, between "one's own age" and those "former"" to shape comparative history as a practice (84). In "Nostalgia and Critique: Walter Scott's 'Secret Power'" Andrew Lynch traces how Scott's historical fiction engages with a particular form of memory and nostalgia. He writes that Scott "writes the past with frustrated and sometimes angry longing for its possession of a potential that was once available but now no longer obtains; he makes the eve of Flodden into the kind of imagined historical scene that Seamus Heaney calls 'a last turn/In the tang of possibility' (Heaney, 1927, 38). Without a Messianic nationalist hope for the future, Scott is driven back by painful longing to a critique of what in the past prevented it becoming the real history of the present, and has made his memory-project disempowered, antiquarian and literary—'a feeble lance.' The past for him is not in itself better than the present, nor necessarily even very different, but the past might have made the present better than it is, and has failed" (213). And Cairns Craig critiques Benedict Anderson's foundational theory of nation formation and that they in fact fall far short of addressing the ways in which Sir Walter Scott's novels investigate the "new forms of the nation to which the nineteenth-century gave birth" in his article "Scott's Staging of the Nation". Indeed, much of Scott's writing has been read as being concerned with charting a Scottish-British history of nation making, concerned with Scotland's joining an empire of its peers, and its integration into British history. In her chapter "Monarchy and the Middle-Period Novels" Tara Ghosal G. Wallace traces the ways Scott Stuart royals manifest in his Middle-Period novels. She writes that, ""Scott refused to provide a synthesis for the vexed dialectics surrounding Stuart monarchs, insisting instead on their conflicted identities,

which occupy multiple and contested positions not available to the tidy impulses of romantic reading" (117). And Patrick Thomas Henry engages recent scholarship challenges previous literary scholarship that "viewed Sir Walter Scott's novels as central in popularizing a cogent, British ideology of nationalism" and instead focuses on "the failure of ideological fantasies like the nation-state and Westphalian sovereignty" as read through *The Talisman.*

This chapter takes a close look at how figurations of kingship manifest across a number of characters, among them Robin Hood. Scholarship on Robin Hood is a rich field, that ranges from his cultural value as a part of the crystallization of a national identity to the part his legends played in the medieval revival. Simon J. White takes the tact of linking Scott's imagining of Robin Hood as being linked to the dispossessed cottagers and smallholders of Scott's own time, including, arguably, some of those involved in the Pentridge Rising of June 1817" in his article "Ivanhoe, Robin Hood and the Pentridge Rising". And in "The Robin Hood of Ivanhoe", William E. Simeone argues that Scott's presentation of Robin Hood in *Ivanhoe* as a yeoman and outcast is intended "to show that from the beginning of the national history, ordinary men had an important to play in the making of the nation. Scott does not speak of a dialectic of history, but his novel dramatizes an idea of history in which the lowest in the social order are as important as the highest" (230-31).

It is necessary also, given the focus of this project and this chapter in particular, to touch on the ways scholars have engaged with race and orientalism in Sir Walter Scott's work. To that end I turn first, specifically to critical conversations about representations of Jews and Jewishness in Scott's work, then following that the Orient more broadly. C.M. Jackson-Houlston traces the use of religion in oriental evocations of the Near East, most especially with how it intersects with representations of gender and rationality while framing religion. He traces in

particular Rebecca's characterization as a learned and rational healer whose medicinal abilities are still conflated with mysticism because of her Jewishness. And in his article "'Which Is the Merchant Here? and Which the Jew?": Friends and Enemies in Walter Scott's Crusader Novels" David Simpson engages with scholarly conversations of Jewishness and orientalism and the Sir Walter Scott's representations of them in his Crusader novels. He focuses on how these representations—of Rebecca and Saladin in particular—buck against the historical reality and in fact call them to account. He takes up Ian Duncan's account of Sir Walter Scott's Crusader novels and his representation of them as oriental horizons "for imperial conquest" which, as Simpson notes, become sites for "uncanny or demonic figuration[s] of cultural origins" (Simpson, 449), (Duncan, 370). It tracks the ways the familiar cannot respond to the unfamiliar and instead ejects it, unable to distinguish between friend and enemy.

More broadly, there has always been discussion of the ways Scott and other writers of the period evoke the Orient in their writing on the Scottish Highlands. In her article "Crossing 'Dark Barriers': Intertextuality and Dialogue between Lord Byron and Sir Walter Scott" Susan Oliver outlines the ways in which Scott's border poetry is in conversation with Byron's poetry about Ottoman-ruled Albania; that is that it carries the mark of a Near East exoticism mostly associated with the wilds of Scotland. And in his chapter on Scottish Orientalism in *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism* James Watt outlines the concept of "Scottish Orientalism" as a project that aligns the Scottish Highlands with the Near East along the axis of development of a civilization and points to the ways that the Scottish Highlands are portrayed in fiction in ways that echo how writers depict the Near East. He discusses how Scott's novels *The Surgeon's Daughter* (1827) and *The Talisman* is entirely uninterested in this temporalization of society and instead relies on a fundamental understanding and belief of 'humanity' as a unifying concept. He

argues that "novels such as *The Surgeon's Daughter* and *The Talisman* offer striking accounts of peaceful contact and exchange, which are all the more remarkable when considered in the context of other writing about the East in the early nineteenth century" (108).

And then of course, there is Sir Walter Scott's own representations of the East. Many scholars turn to his Crusader novels to engage this representation, as well as his 1827 novel, *The Surgeon's Daughter.* Saifuz Zaman and Nisreen Tawfiq Yousef both write about his representation of Saladin, revisiting Edward Said's reading of *The Talisman* by examining how Scott's portrayal of Saladin was positive and historically accurate and that despite that, one need not read *The Talisman* as an affirming portrayal of Islam or the Islamic East. Yousef also addresses the presence of the Islamic East in *Ivanhoe* noting that Scott depicts the 'relationship between the Islamic East and the Christian West as a significant form of cultural interaction whereby the East is presented as complementing the West. However, Scott's portrayal of East-West relation is complex, and it would be inaccurate to claim that this denotes total acceptance of Islamic manners, customs and perspectives" (759).

While these are all important conversations about representation and engagement with the Islamic East in Sir Walter Scott's writing, my argument pivots a little away from it. Rather than his explicit representation, I am more interested in the ways his English characters—both Norman and Anglo-saxon—engage in a sort conversational and metaphorical exchange or reflection of each other. Rather than interrogate how Scott writes Saladin, I interrogate how the ways in which he writes characters like Richard, John, and Robin Hood are shaped by and respond to imaginings of Eastern despotism and rule.

Alf Layla wa Layla: Haroun al-Rachid and Despotism

Two foundational flagstones of the Anglophone study of *The Arabian Nights* in the modern era are first, the search for an origin of the manuscript and second the search for its completion. It is a work that confounds our Western sensibilities, made up of an amalgam of forms, derided by the literary society that produced it, with no single surviving complete manuscript. This has, of course, not stopped the world from cobbling together a complete form: whether that be the production of new tales to fill the thousand and one nights by the Arabic speaking world (here, namely what becomes the country of Egypt) or by Galland or the compilation of all these tales into three volumes under the umbrella of 'complete' Arabian nights (released by Penguin in 2010). Our sensibilities, which are fixed on form and genre, grapple with its reception in the Anglophone world, its impact despite its genre peculiarities, and its situation within Anglophone literature. Less has been paid attention to its own cultural context at the time of its production and the literary economy that governed it largely because it was not a well-regarded piece of literature.

There are two things worth noting to frame both *Arabian Nights* as a lens through which I can construct the Imperial-National project and my reading of *Ivanhoe:* the modes of literature during the Islamic classical period and the attitude. The primary literary mode of the period was poetry that came in a variety of forms—elegiac, venerative, martial poetry, love poetry and so on. Medieval Arabic poetry was characterized by its strict adherence to form and it was the form that dictated thematic turns. It was also the most respected mode and the skilled both in the pre-Islamic era and in the Golden Age could elevate their status in the world through skill and a dedicated patron. That being said, it was certainly not the only one. The Arabs engaged in a variety of literary modes, an important one being translation. At the height of the Abbasid caliphate the prevailing attitude about literature and about *language* itself was that if it was not in

Arabic it was not worth reading. They translated everything that they could and much of the Greek and Roman tradition which came to the West came to it by this mechanism. Things that were written in Arabic were never written with the idea of translation in mind, but with the belief that a person who desired to read literature worth reading would learn the language. As emphasized in the first chapter, this was not only the guiding principle for the rapid translation of texts from other languages into Arabic, but also a foundational belief in the *composition* of 'classical' Arabic texts. The difficulty of the language combined with the ways in which its speakers married that difficulty with form formed the basis of a belief that to translate a text out of Arabic was to reduce it to a 'web of banalities', as stated by Al-Jahiz.

The linguistic power of imposition and translation is not a benign one—and indeed it is the same sort of power that the English language came to bear in the nineteenth century and moving forward into the 'modern age'. But it's worth noting in the context of *Arabian Nights* because the cosmopolitan and global nature of the text has been historically ignored. It has been held up as everything from a great literary jewel in the Arabic tradition to an accurate anthropological text of the lives of Muslims in nineteenth-century Cairo, Egypt. When what it *is* as an artifact is a representation of the linguistic and colonial power that the Abbasid empire had over the rest of the world. The origins of *Alf Layla wa Layla* can be traced back to a Persian frame story called *Hazaar Afsana* and further still to the Sanskrit *The Tales of Bidpai.* The tales included in it bear the marks of the Arabs, Persians, Chinese, and North African. And in fact, there is a North African variant on *Alf Layla wa Layla* called *Mi'a Layla wa Layla* (One Hundred and One Nights) that bears the same frame story but which is altogether different with distinctly North African, folkloric elements. But the power of the Arabic language at this time is such that these North African tales are not told in indigenous North African languages and have instead

been transcribed and recorded in Arabic. The existence of *One Hundred and One Nights* and *Arabian Nights* is one that mediates the constellations of colonizer and colonized and imposes the linguistic expectations of a powerful Arab regime while also engaging in nostalgia as this regime declines. The tension between the origin and mastery by language exists in the frame story itself and serves as a useful frame in thinking through the irreconcilability of the rebellious colonized subject and the well-accepted and even loved colonizer. This dynamic is echoed in Europe at the moment of *Arabian Nights* appropriation into the West. It was not unheard of in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries for translators to argue that their aim in translating was not to render an exact translation of the work but instead to improve upon it as it was translated. There were people who believed Pope's and Chapman's translations of Homer were superior to the original. As Irwin writes, "…humanist translators of the literature of classical antiquity…argued that good taste took precedent over strict accuracy in translation" (19).

I argue that this context supplements the Anglophone context of *Arabian Nights.* The constellation of mastery through language and translation, tension between colonizer and colonized should be joined by burdens born by *Arabian Nights* in its Anglophone context. This is a different type of mastery through language and translation; it is the expectation of realism even as it is relegated to a category adjacent to or below medieval romantic fantasies, and the legitimization of the European specter of the oriental despot.

This chapter takes up the legitimization of the specter of the oriental despot as it haunts the European imagination, in conversation with mastery and colonial relations both past and present. In *The Sultan's Court,* Alan Grosrichard notes that though the fantasy of the oriental despot is "useless as a tool to explain its object, [it] can shed light on its producers and adherents. It projects on to the screen of this distant Other our own impasses and practices in dealing with

power, and stages them" (xiv). The oriental despot has been a figure and fixation of English literature since the early modern era. They are marked both by the sexual control and desires they exert over others—rarely is a despot seen or presented apart from his seraglio—and the ways in which they are regularly uncoupled from actual act of governing. As Grosrichard writes, this is as much about English imposition of their own practices in dealing with power—especially as this figuration continues on through the period of imperial expansion. That expansion is directly linked with governance and the questions that surround it. Who governs who? Why? In what way are the British justified in imposing rule elsewhere? There are many despotic figures in *Arabian Nights* but this chapter is concerned with Haroun al-Rachid who, like Richard and Saladin, was a legendary king known in stories for wandering nameless among his citizens.

Haroun al-Rachid

Haroun al-Rachid takes up a legendary space in the popular Islamic imagination. He is remembered as a just and wise ruler known for going disguised among his people to hear their problems. The reality of his reign is of course more complicated. He was not the "most gifted, the most learned, or even the most politically astute of his dynasty" and in fact there is evidence that he did not *want* to be caliph. By the time his elder brother ascended to the caliphate Haroun had led several military campaigns and was appointed viceroy of all the west, from "Anbar just west of Baghdad as far as Tunisia" (Kennedy, 51, 56). His ascension to power was the product of two things: his brother's untimely death and the persistent campaigning of his tutors, the Barmakids, a Persian aristocratic family that threw their lot in with his and were therefore invested in his rise to power. His reign, historically, is remembered for several things: first, his

attempt to stave off civil war between his two sons after his death by splitting what remained of the Abbasid Empire between them, which in the end only armed each son to take up arms against the other and set the conditions for the eventual fragmentation and dissolution of the empire. And second, the events that followed his enshrining the line of succession: the destruction of the Barmakid clan. Despite the shadow these moments cast on his reign it only took a few generations after his death for writers to begin mythologizing and venerating him, forming the basis of the legend that came to be absorbed into *1001 Nights*.

The average fourteenth-century Arabic-language reader who would have come into contact with the oldest surviving version of *1001 Nights*—the Syrian—manuscript would not only have been familiar with the Abbasid nostalgia that enshrouds *1001 Nights*, but also the historical tale-telling that accompanied his reign. How could they not be when one of the figures that loomed so large in the *1001 Nights* looms equally large in history. There are three members of the Barmakid clan who played important roles in Abbasid history: Yahya ibn Khalid, and his two sons, Ja'far and al-Fadl. Yahya and his son al-Fadl were placed under house arrest, never to be seen again. And Ja'far was killed, his body dismembered, and its limbs hung out on a bridge in Baghdad for all to see. There are much longer texts written on the role they played in the Abbasid empire, but the short version is each of them was an important minister in Haroun's cabinet. They took up governorships across the vast empire, brought in large amounts of revenue in taxes from those localities, and in fact installed a highly efficient bureaucracy. While the Barmakids were in power taxes were paid, mail was delivered, read and responded to in an official capacity, and so on. All of this freed up Haroun to take up the ceremonial and religious role for which he was suited. He made the holy pilgrimage to Mecca more times than any other previous caliph, and he expanded the boarders of the state (an important mark of his office as the

demonstration of his right to rule was codified through holy acts of war—*jihad*). The true mystery of their sudden fall lies in the intimacies they shared with the caliph. Yahya was as a father to Haroun and had in fact tutored him as a child. For a large part of his reign he did not have to observe the protocol others did when entering the household of the caliph and was afforded every respect. Ja'far—Romanized into *Giafour* in Galland's *Arabian Nights,* and Ja'afar in Burton's—was as a brother to Haroun and was in fact married to Haroun's sister. They spent many nights reading poetry, listening to singers, and drinking together—an intimacy afforded to few.

The sudden and complete destruction of the Barmakids largely remains a historical mystery. There is some evidence that their fall in favor began long before their eventual snuffing out—Yahya suffered small indignities for many years before he was placed under house arrest. And many sources point to it being linked to the lenient and conciliatory attitude towards the Alids, a dangerous rival faction to the Abbasid dynasty. There is even a rather ridiculous story entrenched in the popular imagination—debunked, but factual debunking rarely works with stories such as this—that revolves around harem intrigues and covert assignations. Whatever the reason for the caliph's change in attitude toward his most trusted advisor, one thing is for certain: these events and their various explanations loom over the fourteenth-century reader who encounters both Haroun and Ja'far.

Burton introduces Harun al-Rachid in his "Terminal Essay" where he fills in some of the blanks around the history of *Arabian Nights* by writing that he appears in *Arabian Nights,* "as a *headstrong and violent autocrat*, a right royal figure according to the Moslem ideas of his day. But his career shows that he was not more tyrannical or more sanguinary than the normal despot of the East, or the contemporary Kings of the West: in most points, indeed, he was far superior to

the historic misrulers who have afflicted the world from Spain to furthest China." His summation of the destruction of the Barmakids is accurate and generous to Ja'far (though he cannot resist reporting on Tabari's salacious harem intrigue that was debunked by both contemporary and later historians repeatedly). What is worth noting about his summation of Haroun and the historical episode with the Barmakids is that Haroun's role as the caliph is entirely elided and the running of the empire awarded completely to Ja'far, his brother and father. Haroun's ceremonial, religious, and martial duties disappear under the efficient Barmakid bureaucracy for which they are remembered, with no framing or interrogation of the ways in which Haroun's figuration as a religious monarch would have been mirrored in monarchs in the West. Indeed, the dissolution of the empire is pinned on the death of the Barmakids and not on the rivalry-turned-war between his two sons that followed his death. The terminal essay represents, in many ways, how Haroun was seen in the broader Anglophone imagination and many ways mirrors Richard the Lionheart. Burton quotes Ali bin Talib al-Khorasani who, writing of Haroun one hundred and fifty years after his death said that he was "devoted to war and pilgrimage, whose bounty embraced the folk at large." I will come to Richard's kingly legacy later in the chapter but suffice to say that he is largely remembered for his exploits in the crusades. However, unlike Haroun, historical consensus renders him an excellent warrior but a bad king. In contrast, Haroun is remembered as a great leader, who fulfilled the functions of the state as expected of him, and under whom the empire flourished.

When put in conversation with the Anglophone imagination around oriental despots and the Anglophone context, Haroun al-Rachid's depiction in *Arabian Nights* becomes more charged with questions of governance and rule. The absence of action that directly impacts his subjects, and indeed the absence of an overwhelming and staggering bureaucracy that made the

running of the Abbasid empire both successful and profitable underscores the ways in which his figure becomes uncoupled from historical truth and kingly ideals. His going out into the marketplace to witness the daily lives of his subject, and his lack of interference are markedly different than the positive or nostalgic representations of English sovereignty engaged with its subjects (here, notably, Richard who escapes capture, returns to England and immediately thereafter sets about rescuing his subjects. King Arthur is also of note who is always *defending* English borders). Haroun al-Rachid is not ineffectual because he cannot maintain a divide between himself and his subjects, but because the divide he breaches he does not breach to good effect. He doesn't go out of his way to address injustice, only to alleviate his own curiosity. He does it for his own pleasure, and when he encounters peculiarities among his subjects, he requests their stories and gives nothing in return. The project of governance, if it takes place at all, is out of view of the reader. And in fact, I would argue so far as the Anglophone reader of these tales is concerned, does not take place at all. This view is reinforced by Burton's "Terminal Essay" where he explicitly frames Haroun as a useless autocrat who is venerated despite his despotism. The translated, adapted, and fabricated canon of oriental tales in the eighteenth and nineteenth century are filled with men who do anything but rule. Haroun, Shahrayar, Vathek, Nourjahad and the like all spend their time indulging in sex and wine or being preoccupied by their own personal torments. Even Saladin in Scott's *The Talisman* has enough time to take on a disguise and converse with a Scottish knight despite the dual demands of the crusades and the Ayyubid Sultanate. At a time when the British empire was growing and growing quickly the question of *who* ruled and *how* was an important one, especially when many of its aims were turned toward undermining self-rule in indigenous populations and cementing that disenfranchisement with reason.

Inheritance as Language

It is useful to take the Barmakids and their necessity for the efficient running of a large and bureaucratic empire as a launching point for another facet of its bureaucracy: language. The apparatus of language at the height of the Abbasid Caliphate will serve as a useful template for the ways that inheritance functions under the same expectations in *Ivanhoe.* As I stated in the introduction, during this time nothing written in Arabic was ever expected to be translated out of it and all things worth reading were translated *into* the language. There was a burden to be borne by the colonized to take up the language of their colonizers in order to be able to ascend the ranks and move efficiently—and in fact move *at all*—through government. The expectation and *the practice* of the Abbasid Caliphate was one that not only took up Arabic as the legal and accepted language but legitimized it as superior and necessary. For the most part the displacement of indigenous languages was not deliberate or the intent of this linguistic bureaucratic practice—it's aim was efficiency. Over the course of its reign the Caliphate spanned from the Iberian Peninsula (Al-Andalus), over the Maghreb, through the Gulf and the Fertile Crescent. The imposition of a single legal and bureaucratic language allowed not only for the easy flow of governmental information but also for the exchange of culture and literature. This legalization of language meant that it became a facet of citizenship and religiosity that we view that period with to this day. Many of the people that we remember from this period were *not* Arab and yet spoke Arabic with native fluency and are remembered as part of the Arab Abbasid Caliphate. Muḥammad ibn Mūsā al-Khwārizmī was a *Persian* mathematician and astronomer from the ninth century who wrote *Al-kitāb al-mukhtaṣar fī ḥisāb al-ğabr wa'l-muqābala—The*

Compendious Book on Calculation by Completion and Balancing—a mathematical treatise that serves as the basis of Algebra. His work was such that the reigning Caliph eventually appointed him as the head of library to the House of Wisdom in Baghdad. Arabic was then not just a tool of governance but a method by which colonized populations could be absorbed by and ascend within the government structure. Indeed, the Barmakids themselves were *Arabized Persians* who were fully and entirely absorbed into the Arab way of life—culturally, religiously, and linguistically.

In *Ivanhoe* Cedric the Saxon chafes under Norman rule. He has disinherited his son Wilfred for his allegiance to the Norman king, Richard the Lionheart. Wilfred has left England to serve under Richard in the crusades where he is said to have played a notable role in the Siege of Acre. Part of Wilfred's betrayal of Saxon autonomy and self-rule lies in his acceptance of his ancestral home, Ivanhoe, from King Richard. To Cedric the acceptance of his own inheritance from a colonizer functions in the same way as the acceptance of Arabic as the legal language for those living under the Caliphate—it lends the conquerors legitimacy as the legal language is taken on, accepted, and used as a method of ascension. It is, in truth, his ancestral home and by rights his inheritance needs no legitimacy from the reigning--and invading--monarch. And it's Wilfred's participation in the acceptance of the estate that render's not *Wilfred* as the legitimate inheritor but Richard as a legitimate monarch. The inheritance is a point of tension because not only does it give credence to Richard, but it also serves as a way to legitimize the Saxons *through* the new monarchy in a way that is abhorrent to both Cedric and King John. Cedric, because he wants to restore the old rulership of the Saxons, and King John who has gifted Ivanhoe to one of his supporters, Front-de-Bouef, in an effort to cement his place-holder kingship as permanent.

But the work that *Ivanhoe* does on this front is not just about the courtly politics Scott renders, but about figurations of kingship both historical and present. The work of the novel is invested in rendering a past from which logically flows a line of kings that in one way or another lead to the present, 'civilized' England of his time, and in turn the British Empire, including, in particular, its legitimacy in Scotland (at least insofar as *Waverly* hovers in the background). Ivanhoe, novel and estate both, function as legal language that demands the work of conquest and empire be made legitimate not by the conquerors but by the *need* of the conquered. Like Arabic during the Abbasid Empire, the necessary absorption of local nobility and populations into the bureaucratic machine functions as way to cement new monarchical and imperial power, both in past and present. Richard's legitimacy in the novel through Wilfred is as much about the stakes of empire and domestic sovereignty in the present as it is about the historiography of the past.

Perhaps none of the characters understand this so well as John. His serious entertainment of denying Wilfred his rightful inheritance is not just about the petty prejudices he and his court of Normans hold against the Saxons, nor is it only couched in the insult dealt by way of Wilfred's victory over Bracy--a victory framed as Saxon over Norman. Because of the aforementioned circular legitimization, it is in John's interest to undermine Wilfred's claim and bolster Front-de-Bouef's. To honor Ivanhoe's claim would be to destabilize John’s already tenuous position, to acknowledge both that his brother might yet live, and that he is nothing more than a placeholder monarch. Moreover, it is the petty machination of a despot, which brings us back to figurations of kingship engaged with despotism versus functional monarchy. John shares a great many qualities with princes and kings in exotic oriental fiction like Shahrayar, Schemziddin, and

Nourjahad. He is petty, cruel, with no care for the rule of law and every investment in rewarding those who serve his personal goals.

Subjects, Thralls, and Citizens

My project is invested in the ways translations of material interact with and serve the nation-making and imperial project. To that end I turn to Benedict Anderson and his discussion of nation and nationalism, because at the core of my argument about the conversation about kingship as it relates to despotism is a question of nationhood and how it becomes defined through the lens of historical fiction in the medieval revival. Benedict Anderson describes nationalism and nation-making as a process that started in the early modern era and continued on through the eighteenth century and the rise of empire. It is a process predicated on the evolution of shared language alongside the development of print culture and the alliance between language and communal identity. "The case of 'England'—on the northwestern periphery of Latin Europe—is here especially enlightening. Prior to the Norman Conquest, the language of the court, literary and administrative, was Anglo-Saxon. For the next century and a half virtually all royal documents were composed in Latin. Between about 1200 and 1350 this state-Latin was superseded by Norman French. In the meantime, a slow fusion between this language of a foreign ruling class and the Anglo-Saxon of the subject population produced Early English. The fusion made it possible for the new language to take its turn, after 1362, as the language of the courts—and for the opening of Parliament" (41). Though the progress is slower, the linguistic link between nationhood and communal and legal links has its mirror image in the way Arabic was administered and used in the Abbasid Empire. More importantly, this evolution of language as its linked to border points to an imagined nation that did not exist during the time of King

Richard and instead emerged and was solidified later. Nevertheless, *Ivanhoe* argues for a crystallizing English identity in its representations of Richard, who remains and leaves England by the end of the novel (Rebecca and Isaac's choice to depart to Muslim Iberia is a telling reflection of what barriers exist to becoming a part of the linguistic and national community—Jewishness, part religion part ethnicity—is an insurmountable one), and its claims to historical representation in the presentation of a 'medieval English' shared through class lines.

This section is concerned with the moving parts that make up that nation and how they work in tandem—and sometimes against one another—to produce a coherent and stable national identity in support of a model of kingship. It is useful to pause here and define three terms for the purposes of and within the scope of this project: subject, thrall, and citizen. The narrowness of these definitions serves the scope of my project so that as they are discussed below the emphasis on these categories is fully understood. Hence, for my purposes, subject is an individual who exists within the sovereign borders of a nation and is thereby bound by its laws. This does not include foreigners who, though bound by the laws of the land they occupy, do not recognize its governing body as *their* governing body, and would therefore owe fealty or allegiance elsewhere. A **thrall** is most times a subject, but one uninterested in exercising their civic duty and is actively uninterested in the rule of law or public good. Thralls are first and foremost engaged in their own prosperity, and in the interest of elevating themselves and their interests bow to any and all whims of the ruling figure. A **citizen** is likewise also a subject but is also the inverse of a thrall. Citizens are engaged in 'civic duty', invested in communal and national good, and attempt to preserve rule of law where those who should uphold it have failed.

Figurations of kingship, or perhaps even more broadly rulership, rely on a configuration of these categories. A nation-state with borders needs subjects over which it can either rule or

protect (or both), and citizens to aid in enforcing rule of law and championing its values. Conversely, a nation-state with a despot at its head thrives on machinations of self-interest that allow it to continue to rob its people and ignore their needs and protection. Within *Ivanhoe'*s narrative the well-being of the nation-state and its people include both the upkeep of rule of law as established by Richard the Lionheart *and* the defense of religious and economic interests abroad--by this I mean the crusades in the holy land that were as much about securing the fontspring of Christianity as they were about securing trade routes controlled by Christian monarchs to alleviate the tax burden imposed by the Muslims.

Scott marks the despotic nature of John's court in multiple ways throughout the narrative--he is allied with ostentatious displays of wealth that serve little purpose beyond quelling the rising unrest and displeasure of both his subjects and his thralls. And indeed the narrative makes sure to note that these are displays of wealth he can hardly afford--he is regularly in debt to Isaac of York, and the evening after he discovers Richard is making his way back to England, the narrator makes sure to note about his feast that the "purveyors of the Prince, who exercised, upon this and other occasions, the full authority of royalty, had swept the country of all that could be collected which was esteemed for their masters table" (125). To John his subjects and nation are a treasury to be mined for wealth and that wealth is to be disseminated as he wills, with no thought to rule of law but instead in thought of how better he might preserve his position and how in turn those who occupy positions of esteem in his court might preserve theirs. In the same way that Richard and Wilfred exist in a circular bond of legitimization, so too do John and his court.

But it is the members of John's court that perhaps serve as the best signifier for his despotism. Though there is perhaps an argument to be made about the limitations a twelfth-

century monarch has in choosing his court, John surrounds himself with Normans who are narratively couched as being outsiders to England. While Richard in-text is surrounded by such people as Robin, Wilfred, and Cedric, all people who *sonically* are clearly English, John is surrounded by those who are signified as French--Bracy, Malvoisin, Beaumoir, and the like. But beyond that, John makes sure to say on the heels of Wilfred's victory that he hopes "none here will deny my right to confer the fiefs of the crown upon the faithful followers who are around me, and ready to perform the usual military service, in the room of those who have wandered to foreign countries, and can neither render homage[3] nor service when called upon" (118). This statement operates on three levels: it signals a privileging of John's desires over the wellbeing of his nation and its subjects, the privileging of those faithful to *John* and not England, and the disregard of the necessity of military defense at home and abroad.

John's resistance to Wilfred's inheritance is rooted in a model of kingship directly opposed to Richard's and in line with Anglophone-scripted oriental despot. Like many oriental despots in fiction he rewards people who perform favors instead of civil service and elevates those he has a personal relationship with or whose connections would benefit him personally. He is not unlike Schemziddin in *The History of Nourjahad* (which Walter Scott read) who against the advice of his viziers wishes to appoint his lazy and irreligious friend to an important position despite his demonstrable laziness and incompetence.[2] And though King John is certainly more selfish than Schemziddin, he bears those same qualities. Fiefs are not bestowed on those who deserve, inherit, or earn them from the crown. Rather, John cares about pacifying those "faithful followers who are around" him, ready to "perform the usual military service". In the context of

[2] Walter Scott references *The History of Nourjahad* in a letter he wrote to J. G. Lockhart, dated July 19, 1819.

the moment, these two points are underscored by John because Wilfred is a professed supporter of Richard who not only loves his king but ventured to the holy land to serve in his crusade. Moreover "the usual military service" is couched in a moment when he is worried about delegitimating his own kingship and is concerned with rallying "his faithful followers" to his cause to defend against the rightful king. And this service is positioned against both the domestic and foreign investments that Richard has made--that is in investing Wilfred with Ivanhoe and in attempting to secure the holy land for Christian interests.

Neither of these concerns John, because he is not invested in protecting his people, nor is he invested in enriching his country. Instead, he focuses on how domestic wealth and wealth flowing through his followers can serve and elevate him. Wilfred's service in the crusades becomes even more charged when it is remembered that several of the members in John's retinue, and in fact some of his staunchest supporters, are templars. Ostensibly holy knights in service to the church, every templar that appears is interested in the pursuit of power, violating his oaths, or finding a way to entrench themselves further in the country by supporting an illegitimate king. Among the most notable in his retinue are Brian de Bois-Gilbert and Maurice de Bracey who conspire to kidnap Rebecca and Rowena and abuse their proximity to John's throne to do as they wish with subjects and citizens alike.

It is useful to pause here and to define a fourth term in the context of despotic nation-states: **agent.** For the purposes of this project an agent straddles the line between thrall and something else. A creature whose purpose in professing unquestioning loyalty to a despot lies not in an uncomplicated desire to serve, as it does for thralls, but rather in the desire to self-elevate. While the thralls who surround King John profess, “A generous prince!—a most noble Lord, who thus takes upon himself the task of rewarding his faithful followers” (118) in response

to his desire to keep Ivanhoe in de Bracey's hands, an **agent** such as de Bracey flatters and submits to John in order to secure his own wealth and position. In oriental tales the agent often comes in the form of the vizier or the queen mother (and often times that figures is conflated such as with Carathis in Beckford's *Vathek* as she takes the place of both advisor and mother for her own gain).

Agents signal the health of the nation and its government. In *Ivanhoe* they signal not only the John's weakness as king, but his preoccupation with maintaining power, pacifying thralls and agents alike, and undermining his elder brother. So much so that agents such as de Bracey and Bois-Gilbert not only benefit from his despotic generosity but are able to take advantage of his inattention and run roughshod over the laws of the state.

Even before the kidnapping of Rebecca and Rowena, de Bracey signifies the erosion of the state under John's control and the effect of a despotic leader. De Bracey is neither thrall *nor* subject—he owes fealty to none but himself and leads not an order of knights but a collection of mercenaries who find employment during wartime and plunder when there is no employment to be found. He owes no fealty to John or Richard and in fact makes note that he offered his services to the elder brother and was rebuffed, so found himself in service to the former. His presence not only contramands what Wilfred stands for--chivalry and loyalty to the crown--but also signals the weakness of John's own claim. Medieval monarchs relied on nobility to bolster their armies--that John must have mercenaries in his inner circle points not only to a lack of chivalric ideals but also to a distinct weakness.

That de Bracey takes his mercenary company later and kidnaps English subjects under John's rule without consequences from the sitting monarch only underscores John's alignment with despotism. Indeed, it is difficult not to compare the similarities between John and the shift

in military power in Muslim empires during the medieval era. In the Muslim world during the middle ages military service was first born by the most powerful tribes and then shifted to client tribes (non-Arabs who converted), and then non-Muslims entirely and the ways in which this substantially weakened several states. Many Abbasid caliphs found themselves hostages to their own militias because they bore no loyalty to the crown and eventually, as was the case with the Seljuks, usurped power entirely. Scott almost certainly knew this history as the Seljuks co-existed with the Ayyubid Caliphate over which Saladin ruled.

The scene at Torquilstone serves to underscore this entirely. A collection of citizens led by Richard and Robin Hood take up arms against de Bracey and Bois-Gilbert in order to liberate a collection of English subjects, whereas John must take a loan from Isaac of York in order to secure the arms necessary to stand against his brother. His inability to protect his subjects, and his inability to inspire them to rise up on his behalf produces the lawless space necessary for citizens to take up the mantle of rule of law and protect their own against marauders and mercenaries.

Locksley, citizen and yeoman

This section takes up Robin of Locksley's position in the constellation of kingship and rule drawn thus far in the chapter. Locksley occupies a central position in the construction and legitimization of Richard's reign—he is a Saxon yeoman who takes up a form of law and order where John's fails, and yet bends the knee immediately to Richard on his return. He is pushed into marauding and theft by John's failures and despotism—he has lost his freehold and now turns to another livelihood while also enforcing a form of law and order among his men. The text never condemns him for this, and instead uses him to represent a symptom of John's rule. Like

Cedric, Locksley is Saxon nobility though of a notably lower status and like Cedric represents another facet of Saxon discontent under Norman rule. Unlike Cedric it seems Locksley has lost his freehold, or had it confiscated or some such—such that the responsibility he would have to it has been replaced by the responsibility he has to his band of men. While Cedric demonstrates a love of his country rooted in a sort of ephemeral desire to see native rule restored, Locksley demonstrates it by imposing actual rule of law and engaging with the subjects of England. King John's two-fold failure (maintaining a yeoman's freehold and the rule of law) is twice rectified by Locksley. In many ways his is an extension of Wilfred's position--where Wilfred represents the rule of the crown abroad, Locksley represents rule of law at home. More than that, he is a foil to Cedric, who plots to restore Athelstane to the throne, and yet is helpless when waylaid by marauders and agents set on exploiting their proximity to the crown for their own ends. Like Wilfred, Locksley represents acceptance of colonial rule and the possibility that that rule is positive. Theirs is the suggestion that under the right colonial monarch life can continue as it was, with fiefdoms restored to their rightful heirs, and only with a new leader at the helm.

Gurth serves as a bridge between the national and imperial, Locksley and Wilfred, and as a voice for England's subjects who are at the mercy of those entrusted with their care. Gurth is not just a literal messenger between them (when Wilfred and others are captured by Bois-Gilbert and de Bracey it is Gurth that alerts Locksley to their abduction) but as the link between the two. When Gurth protests his own robbery by Locksley's men, Locksley's inclination to release him is not random but predicated specifically on Gurth's desire to fulfill his duty to his liege lord and his honesty in declaring what wealth is his in the velvet bag and what is explicitly his master's. But perhaps most importantly Gurth is the only **citizen** without wealth, land, or stature. His loyalty to Wilfred in defiance of Cedric allies' subjects with no power with those most invested

in their protection not only because Gurth is unprotected himself, but because he voices those very same worries. As he makes his way from Isaac domicile and back to Wilfred's tent he says, "By heaven and St Dunstan, I would I were safe at my journey's end with all this treasure! Here are such numbers, I will not say of arrant thieves, but of errant knights and errant squires, errant monks and errant minstrels, errant jugglers and errant jesters, that a man with a single merk would be in danger, much more a poor swine-herd with a whole bagful of zecchins." (102)

Here Gurth voices not just the worry of the subject that relies on those in power for protection, but lays bare the inversion of fears under King John. He fears not arrant thieves, but knights, squires, monks, minstrels, jugglers, and jesters--all members of court under protection or at least sanctioned by the crown. And so, when he is captured in fact by thieves it is important that not only are those thieves noble but that the thieves escort him to safety in defense against various people connected to the crown who would beat and rob him for his and his master's gold.

Gurth and Locksley's second encounter is in many ways a repetition of the first on a grander scale. Gurth turns to Locksley for help rescuing his master and various others—including Rowena and Rebecca—who have been kidnapped by men under the protection of the crown. It invokes the values of their first meeting--rule of law, marauders operating under the mark of the crown, and the key differences between the agents allied with John and those loyal to King Richard. More importantly, it demonstrates the ability of those invested in protection of a nation's subjects to inspire a sort of patriotism that motivates men to take up arms in rescue of other subjects and citizens. And that spirit and ability is recognized by King Richard when he comes face to face with Locksley as the Sluggard Knight.

Gurth and Locksley's roles at Torquilstone, and indeed their decision to storm the fort and liberate their people at all, emphasizes not only the lawlessness of the country and the *need* for

Locksley in the absence of a true king and the presence of a despot, but his planning also demonstrates a citizen able to distinguish between subjects, citizens, thralls and agents. Though de Bracey's men are dressed like Locksley's band, he is able immediately to identify them as members of the Free Company pretending (and succeeding) at being brigands. He recognizes not only the need for the imposition of law and the ways in which he can help maintain it, but that Cedric and Wilfred and Gurth's tie to Wilfred are necessary in upholding the nation both in the present and moving forward into the future. This recognition works to privilege tenants of hereditary inheritance, the bond between liege and serf, and king and subjects. In the stories we encounter him in Haroun al-Rachid has no such network willing to step in when he is absent or lackadaisical about ruling. It seems that the people around him exist to serve his whims and desires; the vizier—minister—does as he is told, retrieving the people the caliph runs into so that they might share their stories with him and then dispatches them. There appears no legal system in place, no mechanism by which the poor in the streets can receive restitution or arbitration. The closest we get to a figure who can intercede on behalf of the people, who attempts to uphold the nation in its present moment while moving forward into the future is Scheherazade in the frame story. And while Locksley and Wilfred's interventions are martial and direct, Scheherazade's interventions are a reflection of the despot she is trying to reform. Rather than intervene directly she must manipulate him into both extending her life and ensuring the futurity of the kingdom by bearing heirs.

Take a Knee: Richard and Robin Hood, Haroun and No One

This section draws the readings of Haroun al-Rachid's figuration of despotism and Richard and Robin Hood's figurations of kingship into conversation and brings together the arguments made in the previous sections.

Within the wide field of the Eastern tales Walter Scott would have read and been familiar with Haroun al-Rachid would certainly not have been the worst despot in the constellation of oriental despotism--indeed, as noted above he often figures as a wise and beneficent ruler However, he serves as a useful launching off point both because he is well known and because the position he occupies in the Arab literary imagination is much similar to the position Richard the Lionheart does. More than that, his version of despotism as it is figured in various forms of *Arabian Nights' Entertainment* does not rely on violence or evil, but ineffectualness which is useful for the argument of this project here. In fact, this figuration of despotism is common in Anglophone literature—we see it in *Vathek* and again in *The History of Nourjahad.* Laziness and self-indulgence mark and Eastern despot as much as violence does.

This section takes as its launching point a comparison between the moment Richard the Lionheart reveals himself to Locksley and Haroun al-Rachid's interaction with his vizier at the start of his tale, and his interaction with his subjects at the end. Its point is to underscore the differences and similarities in deploying the trope of the wandering king, and the ways in which *Ivanhoe*'s historiography of kingship engages with Near East depictions many of which Walter Scott would have been familiar with. One of these figures is Saladin who figures quite largely in *The Talisman* and who was by the nineteenth century a well-known figure thanks to his appearance in Dante's *Divine Comedy* and his victories in the Crusades. Saladin does not appear in *Arabian Nights,* which is why I am not dwelling on him. Nevertheless, Scott's awareness of him, and his later juxtaposition of him against Richard the Lionheart is important to note because

it clarifies and deepens the conversation about kingship that emerges in the novel as it relates to its oriental despotic counterparts. The presence of the Crusades, of the Jewish characters Isaac and Rebecca, and their later flight to Muslim Iberia all point to a wide and complicated global view of kingship and the relationship between states in the middle ages as represented in *Ivanhoe* that will be highlighted in the following section.

A Tale of Two Kings

The representation of Haroun al-Rachid most familiar to Scott is likely drawn primarily from Galland's *Arabian Night's Entertainment* which many take as the launch of European obsession with the oriental exotic. In the cycle of stories Scheherazade tells the caliph is taken by a strange melancholy that is rare for the sort of personality he has and all his attendants endeavor to stay out of his way excepting his favorite vizier (a romanization of the Arabic word *wazeer* which means 'minister'), Giafour. In an attempt to shift his mood Giafour reminds the caliph that the day was reserved so that he might go out disguised among the people and learn of their problems. Haroun is relieved to have something to do and encounters three people in various strange situations who he then commands his vizier to collect and bring to the palace so he might learn of their stories. When they arrive at the palace all three realize that the foreign merchant, they encountered in the streets of Baghdad was in fact the Commander of the Faithful. In the end, having satisfied his curiosity as to the strange situation each man found himself in when he encountered the caliph, Haroun sends them home. He doesn't act on any knowledge he receives from them and takes no actions to rectify or abrogate their situations.

In contrast to Haroun al-Rachid's wanderings we have King Richard the Lionheart. Up until now he has been mentioned mostly in relation to his absence as its linked to King John's

failure of governance and his presence in the Holy Lands during the second crusades, then his capture after. Though John panics and prepares for his return at the beginning of volume two Richard has been present throughout much of the novel. He aids Wilfred in his victory against Front-de-Boeuf in the lists, joins Clerk of Copmenhurst in revelry and song, aids in the liberation of Rowena and Cedric from Front-de-Boeuf and de Bracy at Torquilstone, and much more. Most important of course is the aid he dispenses at Torquilstone to free his countrymen from "oppressors and thieves" who have kidnapped Cedric, Rowena, and Wilfred (along with Rebecca and Isaac though they are forgotten in the fray). In the aftermath of the engagement at Torquilstone, Richard pardons de Bracey who recognizes him and after alerting John to his brother's presence, flees England. And importantly, like Saladin in his later novel *The Talisman* and Haroun al-Rachid in *Arabian Nights*, Richard the Lionheart remains in disguise for most of the novel. Unlike Saladin and Haroun, however, Richard takes an active interest in correcting the problems that he sees and in enlisting help from his subjects. Later after an encounter with John's lackey, Fitzurse--who he likewise expels--, his identity is revealed to Locksley and his band of merry thieves, who immediately bend the knee and pledge fealty to him. Not content to sit idly by as Wilfred risks his life in a duel for Rebecca's life, Richard pursues him and expels the templars from England.

Ivanhoe was published in 1820 during a time when many of England's neighbors seemed to be in the chokehold of revolution and when it seemed that it threatened at home in England as well. Moreover, it was a time of furious debate about the nature of democracy, the rights of a people over their monarchs and lords, and what duties a nation must carry out on behalf of their people. The points of contention weren't simply what lords owed to the people who worked their lands, especially when many people by then were making moves towards the cities as working

the land became less profitable, but what the government could do about labor conditions, the very poor, food shortages, orphans, and so on. Conversely, questions of civic duty and engagement were also a point of discussion (though only as it pertained to particular classes and categories of men) and what Man owed the State was equally at stake.

In the context of these questions, the differences between Haroun and Richard are stark, and yet the resemblances remain significant because Richard the Lionheart's historiographical legacy, especially as it is linked to Saladin. Richard's presence in England as an engaged ruler in *Ivanhoe* flew in the face of much of his historical legacy. Comparing him to Saladin Hume wrote, "Richard, equally martial and brave, carried with him more of the barbarian character; and was guilty of acts of ferocity, which threw a stain on his celebrated victories." (*The History of England,* vol 1, chapter 10) In the first volume of *The Constitutional History of England* William Stubbs wrote:

> His subjects, fortunately for themselves, saw very little of him during the ten years of his reign. They heard much of his exploits and reconciled themselves in the best way they could to his continual exactions. Under his ministers they had good peace, although they paid for it heavily: but the very means that were taken to tax them trained them and set them thinking. The ministers themselves recognized the rising tendency to self-government in such measures as those we have described. To Richard the tendency would be probably unintelligible. He was a bad king: his great exploits, his military skill, his splendor and extravagance, his poetical tastes, his adventurous spirit, do not serve to cloak his entire want of sympathy, or even consideration, for his people. He was no Englishman, but it does not follow that he gave to Normandy, Anjou, or Aquitaine the love or care that he denied to his kingdom. His ambition was that of a mere warrior: he

would fight for anything whatever, but he would sell everything that was worth fighting for. The glory that he sought was that of victory rather than conquest. (550-51)

Several things stand out in Stubbs' estimation of Richard. First, that despite his lack of kingliness he had a network of ministers and advisors who, as far as Stubbs is concerned, governed England admirably and well, an evaluation he makes by pointing to the lack of feudal uprisings during the period. Second, Richard's absence is a mark against him—he spends nearly his entire tenure as king abroad fighting in wars and shows no loyalty to his nation. And finally, the *manner* in which he engaged in warfare is mark against him. He seeks "victory rather than…conquest"; his selfish ambition overrides the expansion and therefore continued health of the state. Like Haroun, Stubbs' Richard is self-motivated and self-interested—Haroun moves through the marketplace not out of a concern for his people but to satisfy his own curiosity and Richard is driven by a warrior's ambition to *win* instead of to conquer as his Norman predecessors did when they conquered England. Though eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historians differ on the severity of their evaluation of Richard—their judgements range from passionate to cruel to valiant—they seem to have one thing in common: Richard was a war hero but a bad king. He *never* governed. Existing alongside that cultural representation is Haroun al-Rachid and his masked move through the marketplace. The caliph's move through the marketplace does not give the reader a glimpse of the vast empire under his rule, nor its cultural multiplicity or even the complicatedness of its government. We are privy to a single vizier and his primary occupation seems to be pacifying the caliph and carrying out his orders, not attending to government or spotlighting problems or places of correction within the empire. Instead, the caliph's tale and the tales of those he meets and invites to the royal palace only serves to introduce the reader to the marvelous and strange things in medieval Baghdad. There is no attention paid to the complicated

politics that would have plagued an empire of its size, or even the palace politics at play between various viziers and their responsibilities both to the crown and to their provinces and the like.

Conversely, Scott's Richard travels not through a single town or marketplace, but through several counties and to several forts. His travels introduce him to Locksley, Gurth, Wamba (who joins him after they depart from Locksley's home), Cedric, and de Bracey. His encounters with these men are not passive--each encounter sheds further light on the chaos and lawlessness that has sprung up in his absence and illuminates a political or martial problem he must deal with now or in the future. His encounter with Cedric allows him to set the foundation for the reconciliation he brokers between Cedric and his son Wilfred, while also enacting his duty as a monarch to protect his subjects. Likewise, his encounters with Locksley allow him to demonstrate his chivalry (he announces that he will always take the party of the weaker against the oppressor) and emphasize his Englishness (he says to Locksley that he can speak "to no one to whom England, and the life of every Englishman, can be dearer than to" him [169]). Richard, however, doesn't only demonstrate. *He governs.* Even when his allies do not know who he is, when his enemies recognize him he makes sure to dispense justice. He expels both de Bracey and Fitzurse when he is recognized, to divest his brother of his martial allies even as he prevents them from speaking ill against him.

But the encounters Richard experiences do not serve the sole purpose of allowing him to demonstrate what a good monarch he is and his investment in his nation, but they allow those he meets to do the same, and to demonstrate that they are ***citizens***. Here lies the stark difference between Richard and his brother and the similarities between John and Haroun. Haroun is accompanied by a single vizier and Giafour's sole interest is the happiness of the caliph. Richard on the other hand regularly collaborates with his citizens that are invested and interested in

bringing an end to the lawless chaos under John, or to at least ameliorate the damage done by it. And Richard recognizes the harm done is in part due to his absence and works both to pardon Locksley and his band of men for his thievery and to correct the abuses of power taken in his absence.

Richard actively listens for the purpose of governing. He engages the lowly and the high--Wamba, the Clerk of Copmanhurst, as well as Wilfred and Cedric--in an effort to learn of the problems that have developed while he was abroad and imprisoned. And his listening is to put to good use, as he deploys to repair the bonds broken by the Norman invasion and to restore or establish stable rule between the crown and those absorbed into the new power structure, while protecting the powerless. Haroun al-Rachid on the other hand (and John) evince no such desire. John is fixated on his wealth and power and Haroun on his own pleasure as a passive listener. He is interested in the peculiarities in his marketplace, not the problems they represent. At the beginning of his outing with his vizier, he gives a blind beggar a gold coin but is more interested in the story behind why the blind beggar begs to be cuffed on the ear, and less on what has created the circumstance necessitating beggars in the streets of Baghdad. When the blind man tells his story, he is satisfied by the answer to a mystery, but takes no action to improve circumstances.

Richard's kingship in the context of *Ivanhoe* differs from the despotic representations of John's court not because he is *good* but because of his active intervention in the politics of his nation. Despite being apart from his court, he is able to raise armies based on that engagement, to rally men to his cause, to demonstrate a chivalric nature that separates him from John and the despotic kings abroad who he has recently lost a crusade against. His actions in the book constitute a type of governance that none but perhaps Locksley engages over the course of the

novel. And the configuration of his kingship is inseparable from his point of origin in the novel--his absence because he was leading the second crusades.

Galland's unearthing of the manuscript that became *Les Milles et une nuit* is always framed as a 'discovery'. It is the West's first encounter with the *1001 Nights*. In this way a medieval artifact becomes transformed and lifted up and out of time, uncoupled from the great world map of its own time period. When in fact, as Karla Mallette outlines, *1001 Nights* made the Mediterranean crossing long before this moment—both the frame tale and portions of "King Yunan and the Sage Duban" appear in Italian stories. Mallette writes that the "story of Shahrayar (Scheherazade is notable by her absence) appeared in the *Novelle* of Giovanni Sercambi (1348-1424), and Ludovico Aristo retold it in canto XXVIII of the *Orlando Furioso* (1516). And we find a portion of the tale of the King Yunan and the sage Duban in Bosone da Gubbio's *Aventuroso Ciciliano* (1311)." (109) *1001 Nights* has always existed in the cultural meshwork of the Middle Ages and in bringing Scott's imagining of Richard the Lionheart into conversation with Haroun al-Rachid I not only resurrect this meshwork but I reveal the ways in which imaginations of kingship are tied across borders on the Victorian conception of the medieval map. In this way, the specter of Al-Andalus that hovers at the edges of *Ivanhoe* becomes a real threat to that imagination, undermined by Richard's presence and his attention to kingly duty. And so, the map of medieval revival becomes smaller and part of a much larger whole when read alongside these texts. Reading Scott's Richard alongside Haroun then reveals *how* embedded in both east and west medieval revival is and how conscious the uncoupling must have been to reimagine a new history—a new *map*—entirely separate from the Mediterranean and all the paths leading out of the east and into the west, both literal and *literary.*

Haroun and Richard are similar because they are both religious warriors whose absence allowed the rise of efficient bureaucracies to run their nations. While the Victorian historical record of Richard shows he relentlessly and repeatedly undertook the crusades, the Abbasid historical record shows that Haroun left Baghdad over and over again to expand the borders of the Abbasid empire under the banner of jihad. But where the bureaucracy springs up in *spite* of Richard, the Barmakid bureaucratic machine is put into place *because* of Haroun and his active appointment of efficient ministers to high positions. This deliberate and careful intervention in the nation-state is elided by the many *Arabian Nights* translations, and then again by Burton in both his footnotes and "Terminal Essay". In "The Porter and the Three Ladies" Haroun presses Ja'far to violate guest rights and Burton glosses this moment to highlight Ja'far's wisdom and longsuffering piety in the face of a careless and cruel master. Richard, on the other hand, knows enough about guest rites that he prevails on Friar Tuck to share in his wine and the two end up raucously drunk and singing together. These moments point to an active engagement with emerging ideologies around medieval kingship used to set current standards for rule and self-rule. Richard as a kingly figure works when set against his brother, and indeed his own historical legacy, but new dimensions of cultural ideological work emerge when his map is joined to Haroun's. And this in turn is made possible by a British complete cultural elision of Haroun, his legacy and history as one of the most well remembered caliphs of the Golden Age of Islam.

Chapter Three: *Idylls of the King* and *Arabian Nights*: Discovering Infidelity and Constructing Monarchy

In the previous chapter I argued that English literature—specifically, the medieval historical shaped by Sir Walter Scott—was in conversation with the *Arabian Nights* in a way that shaped the ideas of kingship and monarchy and that these ideas were taken up by the British cultural imaginary. In this chapter, I will continue that argument through an analysis of Alfred Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* (1859), while focusing on how women shaped views of kingship and rule. Where Scott's *Ivanhoe* (1819) traced an outward facing network of men embracing different models of kingship and despotism, Tennyson's retelling of Arthurian legend for a mid-Victorian audience traces an inward facing network of women and the ways in which their relations to each other and the monarchy impact governance and rule. In Tennyson's *Idylls*, the destabilization or corruption of a woman's body is a matter of the state.

Modern critical analysis on the Arthurian revival in the nineteenth century and on Alfred Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* in particular is far and ranging. This chapter is primarily concerned with how the relegation of the Oriental Other to the border-periphery in *Idylls of the King* highlights the permeability of that border and how Tennyson attempts to decouple the poem from its entwinement with the East. The most significant twenty-first century scholarship on Tennyson's long poetry such as Stephanie Markovits and Cornelia Pearsall tends not to treat the theme of Orientalism nor the absences or omissions of its eruption in Tennyson's source material. Colin Graham touches on the 'heathens' pressing on the borders of Arthur's map and the function of epic, empire building, and nation-making by defining oneself against the other, and many Tennyson scholars discuss *Idylls of the King* with a focus on Tennyson's Arthur and

his Saxonizing (65). In his reevaluation of the manner in which nineteenth-century poets responded to Biblical criticism, Charles LaPorte links Tennyson's engagement with the higher criticism of the Bible in *Idylls of the King* with "Oriental speculations"—that is that the revelation of the history and origins of the Bible and Tennyson's engagement with the development of religion in *Idylls* links it to "the historical and philological eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholarship that treated ancient literatures of mostly non-European peoples" (80).

Matthew Reynolds takes up how the Italian unification between the years 1850 to 1870 impacted the poetry of poets (Tennyson among them) by bringing questions of national unity to the fore. Few treat the manner in which Tennyson elides his source materials' deep imbrication with the East. And Annemarie Drury treats the intersection of the rising British empire, its colonies, and the act of translation—specifically Tennyson's adaptation of a Welsh-to-English text (the *Mabinogion*)—as a nation-making act. As with Drury and Reynolds there is a tendency to examine the manner in which the nineteenth-century British Empire and its relationship with its colonies shaped how Tennyson engaged with empire in *Idylls.* This chapter is more interested in how the presence of the Orient *inside* England as represented in the source material for *Idylls of the King* become elided within the poem itself.

The nineteenth century saw a resurgence of interest in Arthuriana and an appropriation of the King Arthur figure for a number of national, social and cultural reasons. In her chapter "Arthur in Victorian Poetry", Helen Fulton outlines both the significant amount of literary works penned *about* Arthur and Camelot in the nineteenth century, among them William Morris, Matthew Arnold, Algernon Swinburne, and of course Alfred Tennyson. In addition to their "key poetic works" she includes Edward Bulwer-Lytton's *King Arthur* (1848), Dinah Mulock's

Avillon and Other Tales (1843), Revered Robert Hawker's *The Quest of the Sangraal* (1864), and Sebastian Evans' *In the Studio: A Decade of Poems* (1875). She traces both the ways that scholarship about Victorian reimagining of Arthur center epic poems such as Morris, Arnold, and Tennyson as a space for national and cultural reimagining of Britain as a space of racial and cultural homogeny, while also laying out the ways in which alternate modes of Arthurian storytelling in the nineteenth century opened up space for exploring other tensions. Arthurian tales in the nineteenth century took up broad socio-cultural questions and conversations from religious fervor and secular passion to the question of hero worship, though, as Fulton writes, nostalgia "is, arguably, the dominant preoccupation of Arthurian literature produced in the 1850s onwards." (373) In her article "All Dressed Up: Revivalism and the Fashion for Arthur in Victorian Culture" Inga Bryden traces the connection between fashion and the medieval revival as it was linked to "popular fascination with the Arthurian legends." And Stephanie L. Barczewski and Debra N. Mancoff trace the emergence and rebirth of King Arthur in popular culture in the nineteenth century in their books *The Return of King Arthur: the Legend through Victorian Eyes* (1995) and *Myth and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Britain: the Legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood* (2000).

Because this chapter focuses on both orientalism and how Guinevere as a figure intersects with Victorian imagining of 'Oriental womanhood' it is useful to trace the map of critical scholarship about Tennyson and orientalism and Tennyson and Guinevere. It's clear that many scholars had a response to Tennyson's tracing of gender and sexual politics in *Idylls* and in the Arthurian revival of the nineteenth century more broadly. In her article "'and there She Lete make Herself a Nunne': Guinevere's Afterlife as a Nun in British Culture of the Mid-Nineteenth to Early Twentieth Century" Ellie Crookes takes up scholarship by critics like Debra N. Mancoff

and Stephanie L. Barczewski who "examined the nuances and importance of" Guinevere's depiction as a "vehicle for showcasing the inherent dangers of womanhood" and argues that this scholarship ignores that a "substantial number of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century versions of the tale, lived out the end of her days as a nun. This facet of Guinevere's narrative rather significantly challenges common scholarly perceptions of how the Arthurian queen was understood and depicted at this time, yet the inclusion of this feature of Guinevere's story has been somewhat brushed over by scholars" (124-5). Stephan Ahern argues for the ways Tennyson's representation of chivalry and a "model of feminine nature" candidly depicts the problems of the sexual politics of the culture within which he lived, while Charlotte Boyce takes up the politics of feasting and fasting as it relates to gender. That is that in aligning representations of gendered consumption, Tennyson uses habits of eating as a "barometer of civilization" and tracks the ways in which food and gendered eating can become gateways to barbarism (245). Ingrid Ranum traces how Tennyson heightens gendered domestic vulnerability through Vivien and Guinevere, thereby both giving them more power in *Idylls* and a larger portion of the blame than either incurs in Malory's cycles. And Benedick Turner addresses the absence of scholarship tracing the ways in which female characters in *Idylls* appropriate masculine energy—the 'manly lady' in relation to the femaleness of King Arthur.

And in relation to the intersection of orientalism and Tennyson's writing more broadly, Roger Ebbatson, in his article "Knowing the Orient: The Young Tennyson", argues for the ways that Tennyson's "Recollections of the Arabian Nights" (1830), in addition to Herbert Tucker's 'humanist interpretations', can be read more materially, with a focus on the gendering and eroticization of the Orient and the commercial and economic narratives about the East. Similarly, Emily A. Haddad argues in "Tennyson, Arnold, and the Wealth of the East" that both Matthew

Arnold and Tennyson attempt to grapple with Eastern wealth as its imagined in the Victorian imagination, divorced from empire—what she calls its 'indigenous context'—and its wealth as it is included in and embedded in nineteenth century imperial pursuits. Joseph Phelan offers a broad overview of Orientalism and empire as he traces their relationship across poetry written in the nineteenth century by using Tennyson's "Locksley Hall" (1842) as a launching point. As I noted earlier, scholarship that takes up *Tennyson* and themes of Orientalism tend towards one of several things: the material wealth of the East as it impacts the British Empire, the British Empire's relationship to its colonies and that relationship's impact on national identity (as Drury notes in *Translation as Transformation in Victorian Poetry* (2015) the relationship between translation and form denoted a sort of showmanship—what might the empire gain in absorbing or enacting translation without giving up a part of itself) and its borders, and as Charles LaPorte notes, the ways questions of religion became entwined in Orientalism as the origins of the Bible became concretized for Victorians. For this chapter and this project these are important scholarly scaffolds for what I propose: that the East (both past and present) was at the fore of the cultural imagination that made it inextricable from how Victorians and Tennyson in particular imagined the English medieval past in his take on Camelot. To that end I propose a bridging between recent postcolonial medieval studies done on Arthur to reframe and highlight what traces of the East are elided in Tennyson's imagination of Arthur and how that presence erupts and can be traced around formations of gender.

This chapter intervenes in conversations taken up by scholars such as Ros Ballaster, Khalid Bekkaoui, David J. Vitkus, and Nabil Matar about the ways in which the literary has been and becomes concerned with how women represent the ideological and political purity of the state and the ways in which they can become infected by corruption. For example, Ballaster

considers the ways in which conversation around Oriental women (notably Dunyazad, Roxalina, Canzade, and Turandoct) are in fact two-way dialogues that produce a fictional map of what the 'East' looks like, separate from the facts. Bekkaoui and Vitkus both work to unearth how English Christian women (and other European Christian women) came to 'turn Turk', lured by wealth and sex. Meanwhile, Matar takes up the ways in which the Arabs viewed those they captured and viewed Europeans in general. By bringing these insights together, this chapter returns to the 'elliptical refractions' of world literature and the manner in which the presence of these narratives alongside the translation of *Arabian Nights* in Victorian cultural consciousness (and indeed in Tennyson's consciousness as "Locksley Hall" and "Recollections of the Arabian Nights" demonstrates) highlight an ongoing dialogue and tension within *Idylls* about race and gender. It attempts to render the space between the national and exotic clearer: the ways in which fear surrounding women's bodies in general both white and oriental was presented in literature, and the ways in which English literature has staged that conversation. To do this, the chapter focuses largely on Guinevere and Scheherazade, with some divergences to other characters both white and those marked as Arab, Muslim, or a British imagination of an amalgamation of the two. For the purposes of this chapter **'space'** is a useful literary metaphor that refers both to the imagined distance that exists between the domestic image of those who belong to England and the foreigners who exist abroad, as well as the literary geographic *space* of England and its borders. The Other that exists on the borders of this space is both religiously and physically distinct from those who exist within in—heretical, black or brown instead of white and, importantly, infectious, capable of breaching the borders of the imaginary and literary space.

Idylls of the King is a cycle of twelve poems published between 1859 and 1885. It retells the stories of King Arthur, his marriage and love for Guinevere, as well as tales of his knights, and the eventual fall of his kingdom, Camelot, and its links to Guinevere and Lancelot's long-standing affair. He drew his sources largely from Charlotte Guest's translation of the Welsh *Mabinogion* (1877) and Thomas Malory's *Le Morte d'Arthur*. Malory's work was itself a translation and compilation of thirteenth century French romances known as the *Vulgate Cycle*, as well as two Middle English sources: the *Stanzaic Morte Arthure* and the *Alliterative Morte Arthure,* which in turn is an adaptation of books nine and ten from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain*. This chapter is concerned with these things, but specifically in the ways that engaging Tennyson's *Idylls* not with Queen Victoria but instead with Scheherazade reveals the ways his vision of the medieval is deeply enmeshed with the East, even as he attempts to elide it. As Margaret Linley writes, "[his] deployment of sexuality…demonstrates the relational structure of apparently mutually exclusive gender categories, and in particular the extreme dependence of the masculine upon feminine stability and coherence" (366). That is that constructions of Guinevere's womanhood and her chastity—and indeed other women like her in the *Idylls*—are the foundations upon which Arthur's masculine identity is built and therefore, the foundations upon which the state are built.

The use of the 'Barbary captive' and 'turning Turk' genres from the seventeenth- and eighteenth-centuries is not to suggest that Tennyson's writing of *Idylls of the King* was in direct conversation with these books or even that he read them (though he assuredly read *Arabian Nights* as attested to by his poem "Recollections of the Arabian Nights"). Rather, they illustrate the ways in which ideas and anxieties surrounding the cultural and literal exchange of white and Oriental bodies were well rooted in the English literary imagination, and even as other more

sophisticated genres rose and eclipsed them, they did not simply disappear. Rather, much like the heathens constantly pressing on Camelot's borders, these tense imaginaries remained on the fringes and engaging with them, especially through a text that attempts to recreate a distinct and separate medieval past, reveals the ways in which they never quite disappeared.

Sybils and Story Telling

For the purposes of this chapter, sibyls represent the establishment of a tradition of gendered storytelling within the political sphere that is carried from the classical and into the medieval, then reconfigured in nineteenth-century re-imaginings of the medieval. It is one tradition among many, but that readies the literary landscape for when Scheherazade is later introduced. In Jessica Malay's *Prophecy and Sibylline Imagery in the Renaissance* she notes Bernard McGinn's observation that the sibyl's origin may lay in the east, quoting, "Female seers were known in the ancient Near East, and the scanty sources we possess suggest that it was in Ionia where the Greeks were most in contact with the East that the Sibyl first became a part of Greek religion."

The sibyl begins as a woman of locale, tied to specific places, and her role most likely arose out of conflicts between neighboring communities. By the third century BCE there were a number of sibyls, each clearly linked to a specific locale. But *who* the sibyls were is perhaps less important than what they were and what purposes they served? H.W. Parke's assertion that the rise of the sibyl was due to conflicts between communities' points to their political value. The introduction of the sibyl as a figure into Greek religion created a space through which conflict could be mediated and resolved through divinity as channeled through women. Eventually, their roles outgrew the community conflicts they were introduced to resolve. The sibyl's legacy becomes *not* the conflicts they were introduced to resolve but instead the record of their voices and the futures they continue

to effect through prophecy and story. They are recorded in Varro, Lactantius, Heraclides of Pontus' now lost *On Oracle-Centres,* and Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata*. They become the voice of government—a mechanism through which rulers granted themselves legitimacy.

It is recorded that the Sybil of Cumae came before King Tarquinius Priscus and demanded three hundred philips for her recorded prophecies and that each time she mocked him she burned three and asked for the same price for the remainder (Malay, 6). Eventually he relents and purchases what is left, and later on their number grows as books "were gathered and brought to Rome from all communities of Italy and Greece and especially Erythraea, under the name of any Sibyl" (Malay, 9). Though there is no historical evidence corroborating this moment, it demonstrates the political power of a sibyl's voice. The exchange between sibyl and king sets up a model for control, where the agency of the storyteller is undermined and the purpose the stories serve is a regulated one. By giving over her prophecies to a king, the sibyl ceases to be the sole arbitrator of her voice and her stories and is instead folded into a political apparatus over which she has little control.

Sybils represent the manner in which the stories that women tell—the histories and possible futures—are absorbed, regulated, and redeployed for political use. For sibyls it was first within their smaller communities, and then later the Greek and Roman empires. For Scheherazade it is a fictionalized Persian Sassanid Empire, and for the women of Arthur's court it is Camelot. As I will argue in the next section, the medieval origins of King Arthur are deeply and inextricably linked to the East and though much of that tie has to do with the masculinity of war during the First Crusades, in many ways even Tennyson's nineteenth-century imaginings of King Arthur cannot escape that cultural context.

The Bridge to Scheherazade

Scheherazade enters the English literary imagination at a time when the tradition of gendered storytelling as political power is well established. She enters the stage alongside women such as Morgan le Faye and the Elfin Lady from *Thomas of Erceldoune*, and her stories are just as regulated as theirs by the men who hear them. Her storytelling is not predicting the future, but it is shaping it and deliberately so. She is distinctive because, of these women in the nineteenth century, she is the most well-known.

Scheherazade enters her own story when her nation is in political crisis—the king, Shahrayr, has ceased to do his duty. His first wife was an adulterer and for that crime she and her lover, and all those in league with her, are executed. Rather than assign the source of the infidelity to the unnamed wife, Shahrayr assigns it to her gender. Thereafter each night he takes a bride and each morning he executes her. Obsessed with punishing all women for the crime of one, Shahrayr puts the nation in crisis—depriving it of an heir, stoking unrest in the populace and neglecting his kingly duties.

Scheherazade's intercession is twofold: the repeated saving of herself and every other virgin woman in the empire, and seeding reform about women, justice, and rule in Shahrayr's mind. At no point does she or anyone else consider a coup (indeed—that would be a dramatic reaction in the context of the tale), or the death of the king himself, for there is no heir. But her stories work as a corrective force, reshaping both him and the kingdom. And as the thousand- and one-nights pass, she also produces several sons, thereby cementing his rule and the rule of his line.

The Bridge Between Scheherazade and Guinevere

This chapter seeks to challenge and unravel the myth of first contact between the Near East and occident that proliferates in the nineteenth century, enshrined as it is in the medieval revival—more specifically the cultural myth that England's borders were impermeable to black and brown bodies in both directions, and even as writers construct imaginaries that support this myth, they are fixated on anxieties of its rupture. While much scholarship in current medieval studies seeks to upend these understandings, among them scholars such as Suzanne Conklin Akbari and Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, Victorian studies continues to reproduce demarcations between studies of orientalism and the medieval revival. Criticism on texts unearthed or brought into scholarly circulation in the nineteenth century does not breach this divide, and instead interrogates how these revivals are linked to homogenous national imaginaries. I am instead interested in how breaching that divide—that is linking western medieval revival with the medieval world conjured by orientalism—produces new readings and understandings of British medieval revivalist texts.

I argue that the literary migration of European Christians between the countries and religions of their birth and the East then back to their homes builds the bridge that connects white women and women of the East. And even as they return to Christendom, that they bring back with them with possibility for continued corruption. Their bodies are, as Bekkaoui writes, sites "for fierce cultural, sexual, and ideological confrontation" so that even on their return, their actions and position within the sociopolitical sphere is always in conversation with the east. Just as Richard the Lion Heart and King John were in conversation with Harun al-Rachid, so too are Guinevere, Ygerne, and Bellicent in conversation with Scheherazade.

"The story of King Arthur, I will show, begins in the East." So says Geraldine Heng in the first chapter of her book *Empire of Magic* (2003). Heng makes a compelling argument for

the ways in which various popular and folkloric representations of Arthur, alongside a few mentions in Latin chronicles coalesced into the episodes that occur in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Brittaniae* (*History of the Kings of Britain)* (1136). Specifically, Heng argues for the ways in which Arthur's construction in *Historia* and the episode pitting him against giants is inextricably linked to the medieval cultural trauma of consuming the Muslim Saracen Other born during the First Crusades. The tale of the giant progresses as follows: Arthur is asked to rescue the daughter of one of his kinsmen who has been abducted by a giant along with her elderly nurse. Attempts have been made to rescue her both by sea and by land, but the giant is adept at thwarting them. He throws rocks at ships that approach and devours half-alive knights who make it ashore. Arthur challenges the giant to one on one combat and wins, but the object of his rescue has already died of terror in fear of the rape planned by the giant. Her nurse, who has been raped multiple times, survives. He has the cannibal giant decapitated and recounts an encounter he's had with another giant that he's killed—Ritho on Mount Aravius. From his encounter with Ritho he wins a trophy: a cloak of the beards of kings that Ritho has defeated and to which Ritho wished to add Arthur's beard.

The cultural background against which Heng situates this particular episode has at its roots two moments during the First Crusade: The Siege of Antioch and the Siege of Ma'arra an-Numan. Both of these sieges were long and difficult, and both of them carry with them recollections of cannibalism. Though the Siege of Antioch occurred first, most of the accounts of crusaders burning and eating Muslims come from the Muslims themselves. The event at Ma'arra conversely is recorded in multiple Latin chronicles of the siege alternately baldly stated or framed with justification of famine so severe that there was little choice. The accounts of cannibalism in Ma'arra circulated fairly quickly after the First Crusade. The siege took place in

1098. Heng writes, "Fulcher of Chartres is believed to have begun his between 1100 and 1102, a bare two to four years after Ma'arra;…Raymond d'Aguiliers is thought to have completed his before 1105, and possibly as early as 1102…; and a copy of the anonymous *Gesta* already appears at Jerusalem in 1101. It is widely believed that the Gesta was begun at Antioch and perhaps completed as early as the end of 1099, after the battle of Ascalon—scarcely a year after Ma'arra" (25).

Heng argues that Arthur's appearance in the *Historia* and specifically the episode with the cannibal giant is in some ways a re-enacting and an attempt to grapple with this event. The monster notably eats pigs, a forbidden act in Islam as pigs are associated with filth. Furthermore, she links the episode with Ritho to discourses linked to Saracen masculinity. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries Norman men did not wear beards and many chronicles note explicitly the ways in which beards are a feature of Saracen *men*. Of Ritho's origin she also makes mention that Mount Aravius—the place he calls home—is often translated as the Welsh Mount Snowdon. But, "if we were to treat "Aravius" not as a proper noun but as an adjective that declines identically to a noun—a grammatical alternative—"mons Aravius" can plausibly be read as "the Arabian Mountains," which would return the giant Ritho, like the giant of St. Michael's Mount, to an origin in the Orient" (37-38). The events at Ma'arra produce an inescapable cultural trauma that becomes common knowledge because of the chronicles. Whether or not the cannibalism *did* occur the disturbance it caused culturally is twofold: first it was a perversion of the mission of the Crusades. The crusaders were meant to wrest the Holy Land from heathens and bring Christianity with them, not ingest the heathens themselves. Second, medieval Christians, as Heng writes:

> "inhabited a world…in which eating was overlaid with sacramental, ritual, and symbolic significance, in which time itself was experienced as a pattern of fasts and feasts that shaped the liturgical year, with allowed and proscribed foods on particular days, occasions, and seasons: the regimen of a culture in which what one ate, how much or how little, and when, distinguished between sin and grace, orthodox and heretical practice, inclusion or exclusion in the fellowship of God and of Christian humanity" (26.)

Ingestion of the heretical Other in this cultural configuration then becomes sacrilegious and, in many ways, serves as the foundation for medieval Christian interaction with Muslims. Heng's argument about the ways in which these events are embedded in King Arthur (who, in many ways, takes on the appearance of a Crusader hero) is important to this project because of how it demonstrates and argues for a King Arthur mythology inextricably linked to the East through the First Crusades. Fear of consumption and more importantly infection by the heretical Other is part and parcel of the myth and lives on through its iterations. And though Heng's focus is on the ways that men ingest and become infected by it, I argue that an equally pervasive fear of women's vulnerability to a similar infection—whether they took it in willingly or not—sets the scene for how monarchy is shaped in the evolution of King Arthur stories through its representation of women. Heng's arguments both about the traumatic cultural shockwaves regarding cannibalism at Ma'arra, and its cultural legibility in Monmouth's *Historia* create useful historical scaffolding for this chapter. King Arthur is inextricably tied to the East, but more importantly, Arthur comes to represent an attempt to beat back the fear of being infected by a religious and racial other.

Meanwhile, in his article, "White Women and Moorish Fancy in Eighteenth-Century Literature," Khalid Bekkaoui outlines the literary history in eighteenth-century literature of the

capture and kidnapping of women—mostly from England and Spain—into various harems spanning from North Africa, medieval Muslim Iberia, and the Ottoman Empire. What I am interested in is the relational network he gestures to in this essay; that is not necessarily the way that English and Spanish women come into contact with Moorish men, but *Moorish women*. (For the purposes of this project '**Moorish women**' will refer to women from various Islamic kingdoms during the medieval era, ranging from those specified earlier.) Often time these women serve as guides, initiating frightened women into the ways of the harem and encouraging them to leave behind their religion and their previous lives in exchange for affection from a Moorish man and wealth. Their representation has little in common with reality—they are lascivious and hungry women eager to demonstrate the ways in which their libertine lifestyles are better than those in the West, while simultaneously resenting the presence of European Christian women, and the ways in which the narratives position their virginity and innocence as more alluring than their Moorish counterparts.

In this way, white womanhood in a Christian English medieval context as it is recreated and constructed by nineteenth-century writers simultaneously attempts to banish Moorish women to the margins while also constantly being in conversation with them—their womanhood is built in opposition to them. Their demureness and positionality in the sociopolitical sphere, the ways in which their bodies are vulnerable infection by the Other while also being the sites through which the line of kings must be born, and the ways in which they tell and create stories that influence their nations are always in conversation. These conversations permeate and cross the border of the space within which they are expected to be confined, even as they exit that space through kidnapping, piracy, and capture. And it is around this movement that the national-imperial space is built.

The Coming of Arthur

I now turn to the first poem in *Idylls of the King,* "The Coming of Arthur" and will take as its launching point three interconnected moments: Ygerne's rape by Uther, Leodogran's interrogation into Arthur's birth, and Bellicent's telling and re-telling of Arthur's birth. While women of the east are absent from Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*, I will argue that a literary exchange exists between the representation of English women and eastern women, that their bodies' vulnerabilities exist in conversation, and the stories they tell are similarly intertwined. As Jessica L. Malay argues about the sibyl-figure of the classical tradition and as Heng argues about the origins of Monmouth's Arthur in *Historia*, though nineteenth-century writers and readers may have seen their literary tradition as entirely separate from the East, the space occupied by female storytellers comes to them from the East and is moved through Greece. And it is this movement through space, I argue, that breaches the border between them, that is helped along by literary representations of women 'turning Turk' and the relationships between women they foster both inside and outside the harem.

"The Coming of Arthur" begins with Arthur's ascent to the throne of Camelot and he and his knights' campaign to unify the disparate kings of England under his banner. Prior to his ascension the island was a land torn by wars between kings, pressed on all sides by heathens, and ravaged from within by great beasts who went unchecked since kings and knights focused on war. Onto this scene comes Arthur, anointed by Merlin and bearing the sword Excalibur. He tames much of the island, though not all, pushes the heathens back, and unites the kings.

Arthur's birth and conception are the subject of most of the poem, under scrutiny as they are by Leodogran who contemplates giving his daughter to Arthur, and the few kings and barons

who remain to contest Arthur's rule. As the poem progresses the source of the questions surrounding Arthur's birth are clarified. Before Arthur's birth another war waged between Gorlois and Uther because Uther coveted Gorlois' wife, Ygerne. Uther lays siege to Gorlois' castle and there accounts begin to differ. According to some Arthur is Uther's son, born after his death. According to others, he is Gorlois' son, conceived before *his* death. And yet others claim that he is the son of Sir Anton, a baseborn knight to whom he was given by Merlin. The unstable configuration of paternity around Arthur is just as much about him as it is about the woman who gives birth to him and highlights both her fixity in the tale and the instability of her position.

Outlines of Vulnerability

As outlined in the introduction to this chapter, I argue that the literary migration and exchange between Moorish women and English Christian women breaches the border-space between the two, allowing them to interact and inform one another. White Christian femininity becomes informed and defined against its Moorish counterpart. I want to further argue that those relational networks, specifically in the harem, outline the vulnerability of English Christian women's *bodies* in two spaces: at home and abroad. In this genre of captivity literature white women are urged by other white women who have already 'turned Turk' or Moorish women who occupy leadership positions in the harem to capitulate to the sultans and pashas who have captured them. It sets these women up as part of the pressure of the new foreign space they occupy—the overwhelming sensory detail, the lure of wealth, and so on. But their complicity in turning the innocent and virginal captive also serves to highlight the *threat* under which she has entered the harem. What lies in the margins is what happens if she refuses—the sultan will have his way, one way or another, or she will be left to the bottom of the harem hierarchy, without

wealth or protection. And presuming she does escape the harem, she will not do it with her reputation intact, regardless of what occurred within its walls, and better then to leave with wealth to secure her future then to return to her life marked by the shame of capture and destitution both. The white Christian female body is always at risk, always vulnerable, and that vulnerability is not just physical. Whether or not she goes to her captor's bed, she is also besieged by the sensory opulence of the harem, and she brings its wealth and way of life back with her. And eighteenth-century English writers are aware of the trope of this risk enough that it appears in fiction. In Penelope Aubin's *Count de Venevil* (1739) the heroine, Violetta, eventually returns to Italy after her capture and two-year long sojourn in Turkey (during which she bore the Turk a son) and is, theoretically, able to purge herself of her Turkish lifestyle. But even as she is wooed by her fellow countrymen, she still mourns her Turkish lover and laments that she saw him through the eyes of a spouse. The threat under which the Christian female body exists under, then, is not just physical, but ideological, and escape from the borders within which it was under siege, is not enough to purge it of its contamination.

For writers and readers of these particular sorts of tales, the stakes of penetration and infection are not just personal, but national ones. Khalid Bekkaoui writes,

> "In this text, white female unruliness and libidinousness constitute a perilous threat to faith and race. In the words of Ania Loomba, 'what is especially threatening for white patriarchy is the possibility of the complicity of white women; their desire for black lovers is feared, forbidden, but always imminent.' This peril is further complicated by English or Spanish women's apparently casual willingness to relinquish their Christian heritage and assimilate into a Muslim culture" (159).

Much like the cultural trauma of cannibalism at Ma'arra, European fears and anxiety around infection and ingestion of the heretical Other, especially when tied to the flesh, represent a fear of communal and national contamination. The body, what it takes in, and what it could possibly *reproduce* because of that contact, becomes a metaphor for the desire for racial heterogeneity as it is linked to nation-building and nationalism. Nor is this fear limited to women—fear of capture by Barbary pirates haunted men for it represented the dual fear of either being 'turned Turk' (converting to Islam and thereby being ineligible for slavery) or the fear of torture and sodomy. As Greta LaFleur writes in *The Natural History of Sexuality in Early America* (2018), the travel writing which focused on Barbary captive narratives and centered men that circulated during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries in Britain and America carried with it—whether made explicit or not—"the putatively Islamic penchant for perpetrating physical and sexual harm against Christians" (87).

Into this tenuous cultural exchange enters Ygerne on the national end of the national-imperial bridge. The risk under which she exists is not the risk of conversion—despite that her body carries the hopes of 'faith and race' and like Scheherazade, the hopes of the line of kings. The perilousness under which she comes to exist because of Uther's covetousness threatens her stability because her power derives from her husband, their marriage, and any children they might produce. When Uther lays siege to Gorlois' home in order to secure Ygerne her future stability is put directly at risk and indeed the future of the state. She has born, at this point, only a daughter—Bellicent—and so is at Uther's mercy because the thing from which she derives her power has not yet borne fruit. Without a son to secure Gorlois' line and Cornwall's future, Uther may do with her what he wills.

The various possibilities around Arthur's birth further destabilize her position even after both Gorlois and Uther's death. Despite being a victim of both rape and circumstance, the expectation that she guard her virtue and her loyalty to her first husband and that her son be conceived under circumstances within which there is no doubt of his patrilineage, haunt her. The relief with which Arthur greets Guinevere's barrenness after the revelation of her affair with Lancelot are inverted here—that Arthur might have been conceived by Uther and Ygerne while Gorlois was still alive, that there is any question to *whose* son he might be is the seed of national instability that finds its root in his mother. Even Ygerne herself seems concerned with nothing else but this. In "The Coming of Arthur" she is given no lines, save for her lament on her deathbed that she wishes she might have given Bellicent a brother.

Despite the eventual narrative arc of *Idylls of the King* and the many ways in which it bends toward the internal and external destruction of Camelot and the Knights of the Round Table, the opening poem of the collection cannot shed its anxieties about national stability as viewed through questions of legitimacy and inheritance posed by the many questions around Arthur's birth. In Leodrogan's interrogations around Arthur's birth he interrogates Arthur's knights and Arthur's sister Bellicent but does not *choose* a version of Arthur's birth thereby cementing Ygerne's status as either loyal wife or unwilling adulteress. Instead, he is given a third option by Bellicent: rather than evaluate the unstable category his mother occupies, Arthur has no mother and is therefore freed from the fetters of her vulnerability and penetrability. In a context where a son's legitimacy and ascension to the throne are largely determined by the inviolability of his mother, Arthur no longer has to answer to such claims.

Despite the attempt of this claim to make his birth story unassailable, the poem cannot escape its entanglement with the East. The mentions of 'heathens' and 'Rome' point to a racial

specter as it hovered over the poem's medieval source material. In Geoffrey's *Historia* the Rome Arthur encounters is multiracial in its composition and indicates not the ancient Roman Empire but the "Eastern Roman Empire that is the detested rival of the youthful crusader states in the Levant—twelfth-century Byzantium, or Constantinople…" (Heng, 43). And Tennyson's positioning of the Romans as both weak and conquered by the Britons, forced into negotiations by Arthur's prowess consciously echoes Geoffrey's *Historia* and later adaptations of his tales (including Malroy's *Le Morte d'Arthur* on which the *Idylls* are largely based). Even as the poem struggles to shed the uncertainty around Ygrene it bound up in and overshadowed by the specter of racial difference and its unceasing pressure on the border space.

Bellicent and Scheherazade: Storytellers and Prophets of the State

In "The Coming of Arthur", Bellicent—Arthur's sister and the queen of Orkney—tells Leodorogan two stories to ease his mind regarding Arthur's birth and his potential marriage to Guinevere. Within my project these stories and their telling focalize the dual questions of the voice and the body of women in the sociopolitical sphere: that is, the ways in which even as Bellicent's voice helps to shore up Arthur's claims to the throne, her body has already seeded the cracks that will bring his kingdom down at the end of *Idylls of the King*. In doing so, I will link Bellicent back to Scheherazade how she uses her voice and the power of story to affect the state by telling stories that legitimize Arthur's claim to the throne.

When Arthur first sees Guinevere he puts forth the purpose of his potential marriage—what Guinevere will bring to the union that he cannot bring on his own, and how she might shape the realm with her beauty, grace, and fidelity. He says he

> "… cannot will my will, nor work my work

Wholly, nor make myself in mine own realm

Victor and lord. But were I joined with her,

Then might we live together as one life,

And reigning with one will in everything

Have power on this dark land to lighten it,

And power on this dead world to make it live." (87-90)

For Arthur, and indeed within the imagined English medieval cultural context, a king must have a queen for heirs but also in order to be spiritually complete and to do the work necessary to maintain the kingdom. And the poem takes great pains to outline this work as religiously motivated—Arthur is not only a king that unified many warring barons and princes in a way his perhaps-father Uther could not. Arthur tames the land and pushes back hordes both beast and heathen.

But his marital interest in Guinevere provokes her father's interrogation into his lineage. For even as Arthur has beat back Leodogran's brother and his heathen supporters, many of the barons and princes cry 'this is not Uther's son' or 'this is the son of Gorlois' or 'this is the son of Anton.' In part his reticence is his reluctance to part with his only daughter, but the qualms he has about Arthur and the circumstances of his birth are legitimate ones. To give his daughter to a king that might be usurped on the claim that he might be a bastard would open her up to the particular gendered violence that follows the death of her husband in the grips of such a war. Leodrogan goes first to his chamberlain who tells him the only people who know the true circumstances of Arthur's birth are Merlin, a sorcerer who served Uther for long years, and Merlin's teacher Bleys. He thereafter asks the knights who brought the marriage request, and Bedivere—Arthur's first knight—lays out the source of tumult surrounding Arthur's birth. That

Uther laid siege to Tintagel, Gorlois' castle, and that Arthur was conceived in a window where he might have been Gorlois' son before he died, or Uther's son who forced a weeping Ygerne to marry him with shameful haste. Bedivere, a loyal knight, says that Arthur is undoubtedly Uther's son, and that the claims surrounding Anton stem from what followed Arthur's birth: that Uther's loyal sorcerer took him to a postern gate and handed him to Sir Anton and his wife to nurse and raise, and there he remained until it was time for him to become king. But it isn't until Leodrogan speaks to Bellicent and she relays the signs surrounding Arthur's coronation that Leodrogan expresses joy that his reluctance might be baseless.

But it isn't until Bellicent recounts a story told to her by Bleys that Leodrogan's unease begins to be put to rest. She begins her tale by telling Leodrogan that while both her parents and Uther were dark ('almost to blackness' she says of Uther), that Arthur is fairer than fair. She also tells him that she hears, sometimes, her mother's voice at the dawn of her life telling her 'O that ye had some brother, pretty one,/To guard thee on the rough ways of the world.' (334-335) At Leodrogan's pressing, she relays the first time she met Arthur and the times subsequent to that wherein she became sure that Arthur would one day be king. But it is without the king's prompting that she shares that one day Bleys, on his death bed, summoned her specifically to hear the truth surrounding Arthur's birth.

Bleys tells her that on Uther's deathbed, before he and Merlin, he cried out for an heir, and that thereafter the two left him and went down to the gate and into the night and saw a ship that seemed to float on air not water, shaped like a winged dragon, with shining people on board that disappeared as soon as they saw it. Then the two went down to the cove and watched as the sea swept in nine times, and on the ninth on a wave that seemed made of fire and carried voices a naked babe was carried in and left at Merlin's feet, who lifted him and then cried 'The

King!/Here is an heir for Uther!' (ln. 384-5When Bellicent goes to Merlin for corroboration of this tale, he answers her in riddles.

But in the end, Bellicent tells Leodgrogan not to fear giving his daughter to Arthur,

> ["]…so great bards of him will sing
> Hereafter; and dark sayings from of old
> Ranging and ringing through the minds of men,
> And echoed by old folk beside their fires
> For comfort after their wage-work is done,
> Speak of the King; and Merlin in our time
> Hath spoken also, not in jest, and sworn
> Though men may wound him that he will not die,
> But pass, again to come; and then or now
> Utterly smite the heathen underfoot,
> Till these and all men hail him for their king." (ln. 413-423)

It is important both that Bleys summons *Bellicent*—not her husband or sons, not one of Arthur's knights, or one of the kings who have surrendered to him—and doubly important that it is Bellicent's voice and story that sways Leodrogan. She is the last of the tale tellers he interrogates and the only woman. Neither Bedivere nor his chamberlain allay all his fears, even when Bedivere offers to him a clear and stable story that establishes Arthur as incontrovertibly Uther's son, and explains away the confusion. Bellicent's *tale*—for it bears all the fantastical hallmarks of one—is what solidifies Arthur in his eyes and allows him to pass Guinevere to Arthur. Like Scheherazade, Bellicent's story reforms and changes the mind of the king. It stabilizes the state in a way no one else's reassurances were able to.

Despite the power of her voice, however, Bellicent's bodily vulnerability and her issue seed the cracks of Arthur's eventual downfall. For though she sent both her children from the room, Mordred remained with his ear pressed to the door, and it is through Mordred that the first rumblings against Arthur begin. Unlike Scheherazade, Bellicent's bodily issue does not serve to shore up or stabilize the state. And it is worth mentioning that a women's bodily cooperation with the state (and the cooperation of her bodily issue) is rarely in her control. Scheherazade manages to produce multiple heirs over the course of her marriage and thereby stabilize the state and reform her king, but it highlights the ways in which her body becomes bound up in the state despite the threat of death hovering over her always. And there is in fact no proof that the children will go on to stabilize the state as their mother did. In fact, the history hovering over *1001 Nights* puts proof to that—Haroun al-Rachid's children, despite having the empire split between them in an effort to avoid civil war, descended into civil war anyway and dismantled the empire entirely. The questions of inheritance, stability, and legitimacy become bound up in the mother's body as duty despite the little control she has over it.

It is useful to return to the accounting of the Sybil of Cumae and her recorded prophecies. Even after her death, her prophecies and many others were collected in the capital and were referred to from time to time to determine the course of a government and its actions. This is a useful image—the voice of the Sybil locked away, detached from her vulnerable body, and powerful enough to guide nations. For Ygerne, there is no voice and she has no power. Her one pronouncement over the course of 'The Coming of Arthur' is to lament her daughter's lack of a brother to protect her. She cannot control the destiny of her nation, in part because of a husband unable to protect *her* which in turn exaggerates her bodily vulnerability and leads to yet more national instability.

Not so for Bellicent or Scheherazade. Both leverage the stories they have to change the minds of powerful men. It is telling to that in many ways these stories are not self-serving; both of them use them to stabilize nations, to guide them away from violence and a lack of rule. Without Arthur and his vision of a complete domestic and monarchical sphere, England is plunged into continued chaos. Without Guinevere he cannot will his will, work his work, nor make himself "victor and lord" in his own kingdom. Likewise, Shahrayr forgets the purpose of his position: not to take and kill brides every night, but to rule a vast empire embroiled in anxiety over the possibility of an heir and the threat the governing body now poses to their virgin daughters. And yet, the power of their voices does not in any way protect them from the fallibility and vulnerability of their bodies. Though Scheherazade never displays "unruliness and libidinousness" her body is constantly under threat of being *perceived* so by her husband and king, and that in turn opens up the threat of death that has loomed over every one of her predecessors. For her part, Bellicent's vulnerability lies in her bodily issue (Mordred) and her inability to control him. The nation, both in the medieval and nineteenth-century imaginary, reliant as it is on their bodies then becomes a thing that is constantly unstable, no matter Arthur's attempts, no matter *the women's* attempts. Its perception of such conjures up the specter of violation and infection both in the instability of the line of succession and the heathen and Roman hoards pressing up against the borders of Camelot.

The Last Tournament

Tennyson's reimagining of a medieval England in many ways evokes an anxiety about its source text, about "white female unruliness and libidinousness" that might ally the principal female characters with Moorish women, their wiles, and their desire for wealth and power. Even

as Tennyson focuses on the ways women pose threats to the state and reduces the many narrative signals from the medieval texts for Arthur's eventual fall, he manages to erase the ways in which their vulnerabilities erupt sharply within the text and the ways in which men are complicit in those vulnerabilities. Gone is the origin story of Mordred's birth, whose incestuous origins mark him for doom, and gone too is Monmouth's telling of the ways in which Uther uses Merlin's magic to take on Gorlois' countenance and bed Ygerne, thereby producing Arthur. Guinevere, despite the long affair she carries on with Lancelot, is never caught in bed with him—indeed, it is only the two of them alone sitting side by side on a chaise that propels the *Idylls of the King* into its final act. James Eli Adams ties this aversion to explicit sexual acts to Tennyson's "preoccupation with publicity." I argue that in addition to this, that Tennyson is enacting an uncoupling of his *Idylls* from the East—sex, opulence, and the East itself is relegated to the margins.

The threat of the overwhelming opulence of the East and its ability to convert through senses alone is one well entrenched in the English literary imagination. This chapter has already established the genre around Moorish captivity stories, but there was a tradition too of representing conversion tales on stage, for there was an ever-pervasive fear of men who were captured by Barbary pirates converting rather than enduring slavery. This category of literature usually revolves around Catholics who for a seventeenth-century recently Reformed Protestant audience would already be seen as convertible, their identities and religious practices allied in many ways with Oriental opulence. Degenhardt writes, "[w]hereas the spiritual endurance of the Protestant martyr is meant to deemphasize his or her physical body, the Catholic tradition of martyrdom revolves around the resilient physicality of the virgin's body – its deliberate gendering, its intactness, its oneness with the soul, and its materialization of sexual and spiritual

chastity" (97). Tennyson avoids the messiness of his source material in a way that avoids the Catholic-Oriental alignment—in many ways circumnavigating the ways that seventeenth- and eighteenth-century fictions and plays would have created a slippery alliance between them for their Protestant audiences. Despite that, he cannot escape how these fears are entrenched in the cultural imaginary, nor the ways in which they hover at the edges and borders of his Camelot. Even as the poems elide the entrenched physicality of these events and their relation to women's bodies, the poems are unable to ignore them once Guinevere and Lancelot are caught, and the possibility of a stable heir is lost. Once that possibility ruptures, the heathens at the border come pouring in, and the bodily opulence comes with them.

Guinevere's Babe and Scheherazade's Sons

The tenth poem in *Idylls of the King*, "The Last Tournament" begins with an image of Arthur's fool, Dragonet, dancing with a ruby necklace. The ruby necklace, the reader learns, was the prize won by Tristram at a tournament, and its origins are as follows. Arthur and Lancelot ride at the base of a cliff and come upon a hollow, black tree stump. Inside is an eagle's nest and inside the nest rests a 'maiden babe' with a ruby necklace thrice wrapped around her throat. When they return to the castle, they bring the babe with them, and Arthur gives her to Guinevere to raise as her own. Guinevere is initially resistant—'coldly' acquiesced to receive it 'in her white arms'—but eventually comes to love the babe and names her Nestling. In time, however, the babe is struck with 'mortal cold' and dies. She keeps the ruby necklace, until she can't bear being haunted by the child, and gives it over to Arthur who makes it a prize in the titular last tournament.

The origins of Nestling in many ways echo the opening questions of this chapter and of *Idylls of the King*. The future of the nation rests on the possibility of an heir, and until now Guinevere has not produced a son—she has not produced a child at all. The instability of the court, its corruption, and Camelot—and Arthur in particular—being open and vulnerable to attack from foes such as the Red Knight all point back to the eventuality of a vacuum of power. The throne might pass to Lancelot or to any other of his knights or princes, but there is no guarantee and no line of heirs in place to prevent a war for the crown.

Arthur and Lancelot's joint discovery of the babe in many ways echoes both the troubles and instability surrounding Arthur's own birth and highlights how Camelot's own future stability are in peril. The arrival of Nestling—or rather, her discovery—is heralded by natural signs, and she is discovered by two men. Arthur and Lancelot's part in the discovery and in her being given to Guinevere can substitute both Merlin and Bleys' discovery of Arthur, as well as the questions around his birth. For if Guinevere *were* to produce a child, even though Arthur might not be aware, there is enough suspicion at court regarding her affair with Lancelot that the legitimacy of the child would always be in question, and therefore its ability to succeed Arthur and maintain the throne always in doubt. Despite that, Nestling offers a momentary return to innocence for both Guinevere and the court at Camelot. Her death signals a very real end: of innocence and of the golden age of Arthur's court. The last tournament, with the babe's ruby necklace as its prize, becomes a mockery of all they were and all they might have been if Guinevere had fulfilled the ascribed role, both bodily and with her voice. Indeed, Guinevere does not use her voice at all in "The Last Tournament" and her body is barely present. In some ways she is more akin to a shade than a queen. The absence of her voice is particularly telling if we take David Quint and Amanda Hodgson's theories on the links between the epic and the formation of Victorian national poetry.

Hodgson argues that even if Tennyson did not see his *Idylls* as an epic, his contemporaries and reviewers certainly did, for it took up mythology and national inheritance and reconfigured it to engage with the present and offer its readers a complete vision of history. For Hodgson, the narrative *voice* is what bridges mythology and history to create both coherent, linear plot and a sense of security for the reader. Guinevere's absent voice points not only to her grief, but also the very real dissolution of the narrative epic as it is linked to the dissolution of the state.

The weight that Guinevere's body bears in terms of the ideological values of the state—fidelity, spirituality, and its continued existence through heirs—and its future finally come to fully bear on the events that follow. Her inability to produce an heir—indeed to even keep a surrogate alive—complicated by her longstanding affair with Lancelot steers the court toward its end. An argument can be made that on some level she recognizes this—she withdraws from any semblance of joy and gives up the ruby necklace for the tournament. The ladies of the court take their lead from her and their behavior reflects a degradation of morals and virtue at court. Guinevere's barren womb then is not just a passive quality but an active failure that encompasses not only the possibility of a future heir, but also the ways in which her voice has failed to guide the court. The nation might have withstood the lack of an heir, but because her body is both hers and representative of the nation, she becomes the agent of infection. She is not Bellicent or Scheherazade, whose words can stabilize thrones and reform kings. Her grief surrounding Nestling's death echoes Ygerne's cries—'O that ye had some brother, pretty one,/To guard thee on the rough ways of the world.' In some ways, Guinevere reproduces the horror of cannibalism at Ma'arra—she is meant to stand for Christian virtue and instead introduces an infection that signals the end of the state.

The death of the child—the death of *innocence*—signals the final rupture. It is no accident that on the heels of this death that the Red Knight appears to challenge Arthur, drawing him away from the court, nor an accident that the implication is that he has existed within Arthur's realm for some time. If Guinevere's body is, as Bekkaoui writes, the "site for fierce cultural, sexual, and ideological confrontation" than even before the death of the child she has lost multiple battles. The values Guinevere's body is a stand in for, that encompass a Christian white femininity, have already been violated and the final rupture signals the ever-present threat of 'heathens' on their borders ability to enter and bring with them their opulence, libidinous, and religion.

All the King's Men

This section outlines the literary migration events between Moorish men and white Christian men, and the ways in which outward facing government is held by Arthur and though he suffers the consequences is uninfected by Guinevere's adultery and many spiritual and ideological failures. Like white Christian women, white Christian men were historically captured and pressed into slavery, whether on Barbary pirate ships or for more libidinous reasons—at least in the white cultural imaginary. Bekkaoui summarizes one of Aubin's tales regarding such. He writes,

> "This ambiguity is also inherent in Aubin's *Noble Slaves* (1722), a novel which, like most of Aubin's fictional works, echoes the structural framework of the *Arabian Nights.* Here an affluent Algerian widow purchases a slave and his spouse Clarinda, who masquerades as his sister to avoid ill-treatment. The Algerian lady accosts her slave to gratify her lust, and he yields without compunction. In exchange for his submission, he says opportunistically, 'I

was denied nothing'. He diligently 'continued to please Admela the Widow' without failing to find the opportunity to sneak regularly into Clarinda's room to take 'the Privilege of a Husband to enjoy my virtuous Wife'. And thus, we are presented with a Christian who is leading a polygamous life in Barbary according to Islamic marital laws, sanctioned by his complicitous and acquiescent spouse. By the time his wealthy owner has died, he has 'got much Riches of the Widow's into my Power'. The reiteration of such promiscuous conduct in a discourse which consciously glorifies empire and denigrates cultural difference creates intense moral confusions and dilemmas, dispersing any unified ideological position" (164).

I argue that alongside the ideological and cultural confusion this representation generates is a gendered thread that positions white Christian women as carriers of possible ideological and religious infection whereas for their male counterparts those borders are permeable. A man may turn Turk then return to his life as a member of society, whereas a woman's crossing into captivity will mark her permanently whether or not she was truly converted. For Clarinda's spouse, he can partake of wealth, sexuality, and religion, and still at some point return to Christendom wealthier, his status unchanged so long as he converts back. This is a useful means of understanding the ways in which Arthur suffers the consequences of Guinevere's adultery on a political scale but retains his ideological and cultural purity.

His court and his knights on the other hand do not. I argue that the "moral confusions and dilemmas" brought about by the "reiteration of promiscuous conduct in a discourse which consciously glorifies empire and denigrates cultural difference" are, in this context, intrinsically bound up in the state and the ways in which women's bodies are stand ins for moral values and ideologies (Bekkaoui, 163). This framework then clarifies the ways in which Arthur's purity is

not by accident and is instead set *against* the ideological contamination suffered by Guinevere and those around her. His continued ignorance of his wife's affair and the ways in which she has violated his expectations as his wife and partner protects him and, in many ways, prolongs the life of the state. His discovery of her affair is the moment of its dissolution.

Guinevere's failures as the ideological and spiritual soil of the state don't simply turn the court towards debauchery and libidinous. It is not only the loss of chivalry at the tournament. Guinevere's adultery effects the border against heathens. Their raucousness at the tourney is reflected in the knights Arthur takes with him to assail the tower and the Red Knight—they don't hold when Arthur commands them to, nor do they show mercy. Instead they swarm the field, the tower, and the Red Knight's followers. As they overtake and massacre the tower inhabitants the poem reads, "So all the ways were safe from shore to shore,/But in the heart of Arthur pain was lord." (ln. 485-6) In many ways Arthur's knights become indistinguishable from the Red Knight's followers, and the imagery within the tower, filled with courtesans and raucous knights before they are slain echoes the untamed revelry at the last tournament. Guinevere's failure to embody and model particular values and furthermore to produce an heir that would stabilize the kingdom seeds the discord that in turn weakens the knights and makes them susceptible to incursions from without and within. And this in many ways plays against the widely accepted ending of *Nights* which shows Scheherazade presenting Shahrayr with sons to stabilize the political turmoil his wife-a-night policy has stoked.

Arthur and Mordred, Shahrayr and Shahzaman

At this point it is useful to turn from Guinevere and the various failings the narrative has pinned to her and turn instead to Arthur and the question of governance as it was addressed in the

previous chapter. As I've stated earlier in this chapter, Arthur retains his dignity and his chivalry despite the ways in which his court and his knights become susceptible to ribald behavior. And I argue that the diffuse way gender is configured in the court and ideological tensions are staged through gender contribute to the ways in which readers recognize the state within *Idylls of the King.* More importantly, Arthur's ideological purity is linked to his governance—that is, in order to be a good king, he cannot pay attention to rumor and is therefore insulated from the whispers that propagate about his queen, while also defenseless against the ways she and Lancelot corrode the heart of his court.

Arthur's relentless ignorance of his wife's infidelities and his knight's broken trust are important especially when read against perhaps the most widely known story of infidelity in the East by English readers (outside of the Bible), *Arabian Nights.* Before Scheherazade can use her voice to intercede on behalf of her nation with her husband. Shahrayr had an unnamed wife. And though the story is not clear at what point in their marriage his unnamed wife strayed from her marital duty, what *is* clear is that they have no royal issue. What is important, too, is the context of his discovery. Shahrayr hunts daily—when he attends to the matters of government, the tale does not convey at any point—and it is during his absences that his wife and her conspirators engage in debauched behavior. And it is his brother Shahzaman's ability to leave his own kingdom in stewardship of someone else and while away his time in misery and grief (he similarly caught his wife in the embrace of another and killed her) that he catches his sister-in-law in the act. The text invests little time in questions of the state and their wives functions as connected to it—instead, Shahrayr, like his brother, kills his wife and her conspirators. So begins *Arabian Nights*.

It is useful here to fold into the reading of the assault of the tower of the Red Knight the opening section of 'Guinevere', the poem that follows. In the opening of 'Guinevere' the queen and Lancelot say their goodbyes for the last time before he means to return to his own castle. Before he can leave, the two are caught by Mordred and his men. Lancelot attacks Mordred, casting him out, then flees to his stronghold where he must gather his men. Guinevere, for her part, flees to a nunnery. When Guinevere next sees Arthur he grants her forgiveness arrayed in battle armor to defend his kingdom against Lancelot and Mordred both.

Mordred and Shahzaman's discovery of infidelity and their reactions to them conjure for the readers configurations of the ways in which cultural differences are embedded in the links between the personal and national. Throughout *Idylls of the King,* Mordred stalks threads that might usurp Arthur's throne from the very beginning. He presses his ear to the door that he might hear the various tales of Arthur's birth, he listens and eavesdrops with Viviene, and he tracks the various meetings and whispers between Lancelot and Guinevere. But at no point does he go to his king, or indeed unravel the web that protects the two adulterers. His aim is not the dissolution of Arthur's household or honor, but the throne itself—Guinevere's marriage and her adultery are a matter of the *state.* Conversely, Shahzaman wastes little time reporting his sister-in-law's transgressions to his brother—and the repercussions against their wives are personal. Neither of the brothers in *Arabian Nights* are interested in the ways in which their wives are connected to the national. Their transgressions are a matter of personal honor and must be treated as such. Arthur, Lancelot, and Mordred's march to war reveals that Guinevere's transgression is not so much about her, but about the ways she is a stand in for the state and its future. She survives because her disgrace removes her from that position and her barrenness saves her from being directly embroiled. And the ways in which the final conflicts play out reifies how men can

detach themselves from bodily shame and failure and reconfigure the state around them. Despite that, even as that conflict plays out, the implicit understanding of the narrative is that Camelot has died without an heir, and that Guinevere's failure to speak and to bear children has doomed it. While Scheherazade, too, stands for all women she argues for an array of womanhood to exist. On the other hand, Guinevere bears the burden of existing in a "society that depends upon their flawlessness" (Ranum, 40). "Domestic vulnerability" as Ranum calls it, "becomes central to Tennyson's Arthuriana" gifting Guinevere more power and then more blame than she earns in Malory's version (40). She does not need to and cannot reform Arthur, while Scheherazade must take on the unwomanly task not only of emulating domestic womanhood, but also reforming the king and therefore the state.

Margaret Linley traces out how formations of womanhood in the late nineteenth century impacted Tennyson's formation of Guinevere. She writes that, "women's presumed maternal nature dictated that her most important contribution to society would be through those values related to nurture—self-denial, self-sacrifice, passivity, stability, morality, and affection. Through the generalization of the middle class ideal of womanhood, women as a group were expected to bear the moral responsibility for the entire …" (365-366). It is amidst these formations of womanhood—contested as they are by ongoing women's rights activism, the Divorce Act debates of the 1850s, and so on—that Guinevere, Ygerne, and Bellicent are formed and under this burden of moral responsibility that they nevertheless manage to cross the bridge to Scheherazade. While much can be and has been said about the ways in which masculinity and manhood intersects with fears centered on 'turning Turk' or ingesting the Oriental other in a way that contaminates the body, that threat and presence is perceived two-fold for women. They are

ideologically at risk from the heathens on the border, and the Barbary pirates that at times fared as far north as Ireland in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Within this historical and literary context comparisons of womanhood are not only inevitable but productive. Reading Scheherazade and her particular Victorian iteration—as a queen who can use the power of story to sway kings—alongside Tennyson's imaginings of medieval womanhood as it relates back to the Victorian reveals the ways in which even nineteenth century imaginings of medieval womanhood were linked back to the East. That is in order to outline purity and morality, one had to define it *against* something and that was often the East—its libidinousness, opulence, and perceived paganism. And in reading these women in Arthurian legend as they have been constructed by a Victorian imagination against another medieval woman—this one perhaps the most well-known in Victorian England—who has been scrupulously set aside in her own domain, we reveal new dimensions of understanding *how* this womanhood is constructed and the ways in which the medieval revival and the cultural imaginary that came along with it remained deeply enmeshed in elaborate imaginations of the East even as those historical spaces are elided.

Coda: A Return

As I mentioned in the introduction to my dissertation, I am asked with some regularity at book events if I penned the poetry the main character of my novel recites or if there is a source. I often share the story of my mother and I translating it together and the difficulties around the translation of a single world: pearl. And I try to historically contextualize the snippet of poem as much as I am able. The context of Ibn Zaydun's "The Nunniya" is this: In the eleventh century, Cordoba was under the rule of the Umayyad dynasty, the last branch of a dynasty that ruled the Muslim empire from Syria between the years of 661 and 750. After they were usurped by the Abbasids most of the branch was snuffed out, but those who survived escaped to Muslim Iberia and set up a caliphate. Wallada bint al-Mustakfi was the daughter of the caliph Muhammad III. Wallada herself was a skilled and well-respected poet, and something of a rebel. She wore transparent tops and harem pants in public, and she stitched her own poetry into her clothes. She gained recognition not only for her controversy but also for her success at public poetry competitions. It was during one of these poetry competitions that she met Ibn Zaydun and they began a great love affair. There is a great deal of poetry that marks the length of their affair as well as a great deal of poetry that marks its end. It is said that Wallada heard Ibn Zaydun laugh at a joke a slave girl told, and she was so furious she threw him out of her poetry salon. While Wallada moved on her with her life (she took up with Ibn Zaydun's political rival), Ibn Zaydun never forgot her and wrote much poetry trying to win her back, lamenting the dissolution of their relationship. "The Nunniya" falls into this category.

Within the context of the Islamic kingdoms of the middle ages and the vibrant literary cultures they spawned, "The Nunniya" signifies a great deal. It points to a literary culture married to form and rigor. It also signals a transnational cultural migration, for the forms we find

emerging in Muslim medieval Iberia were carried back and forth across North Africa, to Cairo and to Baghdad and beyond. Wallada's public affair with Ibn Zaydun which sparked his penning the poem also troubles our laymen modern understanding of what life was like for medieval Muslim women and their positions in the public sphere. It also troubles our understanding of what power they held—Wallada did not simply throw Ibn Zaydun from her salon. She had him exiled from the city of his birth, all his power stripped from him, and all his property confiscated. Our understanding of how Wallada's contemporaries would have understood Muslim womanhood is also troubled by Ibn Zaydun's inclusion of 'pearl' in his veneration of her character in the poem; Wallada is the pearl in question but her two greatest affairs (Ibn Zaydun and his successor, Ibn Abdùs) occurred outside of marriage. Her relationship with Ibn Abdùs lasted until his death.

None of this is apparent at first or second glance of my translation. Indeed, unless you have any familiarity with the complicated history of Islamic empire in the middle ages, the short story I told above sketching out their love affair gestures to only some of this. So then, what *does* it signify in its new iteration? For the unfamiliar reader, a number of things. Its recitation is an act of cultural reclamation for two characters in a moment when they are not sure if they will survive the colonial regime under which they both live. In this way it signifies resistance as it is built into retaining indigenous language and recuperating a culture that has been systematically reduced to almost nothing. The romantic veneer is still there but it becomes reconfigured—in this context, "The Nunniya" ceases to be a lament, stripped as it is of the rest of the poetry and the historical context. Instead, it acts as a bridge between two characters, drawing them tighter together through shared trauma and a discovery of shared language. More importantly, as the

poem crosses national, cultural, and temporal borders it is bound up in the representation of womanhood and the ways that women resist colonial rule.

In some ways, my use of this poem cannot escape the Victorian construction of Scheherazade. Karla Mallette writes that, "the story of the valiant vizier's daughter become sultaness, who saves her city by enmeshing the murderous sultan in a net of tales, insinuates itself into the fabric of the stories within the frame. They are seen by modern readers (and modern writers) as celebrations of the capacity of narrative to vanquish abuses of power in the sphere of politics or of psychology. Scheherazade has been canonized as the patron saint of literary invention in successive generations of Western works that riff on the *Nights*, from novels to movies and even to translations of the *Nights*…" (104). And in every way my translation represents the national-world literature I have spent this dissertation excavating. That is, that in removing it whether deliberately or incidentally, from its host culture and introducing it into the multicultural twenty-first century milieu of young adult literature I have transformed the text and given rise to new meanings and new ways of understanding. The biracial or postcolonial reader who encounters the text, nested as it is in a narrative about indigenous colonial resistance will not think of Muslim colonial efforts in Muslim Iberia, but instead the wide-spread colonial efforts of European powers in the nineteenth century. When they encounter the main character as she is linked to this poem, they will rarely think of Wallada and instead what will emerge is an understanding of subjecthood under difficult regimes and the ways that art can recuperate selfhood and identity. Wallada, like Scheherazade, then becomes a figure against which new definitions of self and national identity—or postcolonial identity—can be shaped as we interrogate how we receive and internalize a text from another culture and the ways in which it is circulated within a new culture.

My project is invested in these new ways of knowing. I am not interested in ceasing all translations or asking for a radical and rigorous methodology which most graduate students and scholars would find impossible. Instead, I want to take the moments when we are told 'you don't understand' as moments of tension and as generative places to create new meanings. One text is not one thing all the time, and its reading, reception, and meaning-making shift from place to place and culture to culture. This is not to say that there is no static or core meaning, but instead that translations produce new texts and pretending that they do not does a disservice to the translator, the translation, and the original text. Pressing on places of tension in translations, spaces where the translator has had to make accommodations of style and substance to render the text understandable to a new audience provide us with new places to excavate meaning about the culture interacting in and interesting ways with the text.

More specifically, in a Victorian context reading these spaces of national-imperial tension in translation reveal to us the ways in which history-making during the Victorian period was an ongoing process, both conscious and unconscious. As Amanda Hodgson writes, the Victorians were insistent "on the primacy of narrative art, [were crucially aware] of the shaping power of the past, of tradition and inheritance, and their sense of themselves as the representatives of a powerful and imperial nation..." (341). In this way the demarcation of East and West through translation and a careful curation of history through the medieval revival in itself is a revelatory act not only about the 'reality' of what history might have been, but what they were very anxious for it *not to be*.

Bibliography

Adams, James Eli. "Harlots and Base Interpreters: Scandal and Slander in "Idylls of the King"." *Victorian Poetry* 30.3-4 (1992): 421-439.

Ahern, Stephen. "Listening to Guinevere: Female Agency and the Politics of Chivalry in Tennyson's Idylls." *Studies in Philology* 101.1 (2004): 88-112.

al-Hamadhani, Badi' al-Zaman. *Maqāmāt Abī al-Faḍl Badī' al-Zamān al-Hamadhānī*. Beirut: al-Matba'ah al-Kathlukiya, 1965.

Ali, Samer M. *Arabic Literary Salons in the Islamic Middle Ages: Poetry, Public Performance, and the Presentation of the Past*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010.

Ali, Tariq. *The Book of Saladi*. New York: Verso, 1990.

Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy (The Inferno, The Purgatorio, and The Paradiso)*. Ed. John Ciardi. New York: Berkley, 2003.

al-Jahiz, Abi Uthman Amr ibn Bahr. *al-Hayawan*. Ed. Abd al-Salam Muhammad Harun. Egypt: Mustafa al-Babi al-Halabi, 1966.

al-Khwarizmi, Muhammad ibn Musa. *Al-kitāb al-mukhtaṣar fī ḥisāb al-ğabr wa'l-muqābala*. 820.

al-Ma'arri, li-Abi al-'Ala. *Risālat al-Ghufrān*. Beirut: Dar al-Sadir lol-Tiba'ah wa-al-Nashr, 1964.

al-Nadim, Muhammad ib Ishaq Ibn. *al-Fihrist*. Ed. Yusuf Ali Tawil. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, 1996.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verson, 2016.

Anonymous. *A Hundred and One Nights*. Ed. Bruce Fudge. New York: New York University Press, 2016.

—. *Fables of Bidpai*. London: Simon Stafford, 1601.

—. *The Arabian Nights: Tales of 1001 Nights*. Ed. Ursula Lyons Malcom C. Lyons. 3 vols. New York: Penguin Classics, 2010.

—. *The Song of Roland*. Ed. Dorothy L.Sayers. New York: Penguin Classics, 1957.

Antoine Galland, Robert L. Mack (ed.). *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Apter, Emily. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. New York: Verso, 2013.

Aravamudan, Srinivas. *Enlightenment Orientalism: Resisting the Rise of the Novel* . Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Aubin, Penelope. *The Noble Slaves*. London: E. Bell, J. Darby, A. Bettesworth, F. Fayram, J. Pemberton, 1722.

—. *The Strange Adventures of the Count De Vinevil and His Family*. London: E. Bell, J. Darby, A. Bettesworth, F. Fayram, J. Pemberton, J. Hooke, C. Rivington, F. Clay, J. Batley, and E. Symon, 1739.

Ballaster, Ros. *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England 1662-1785*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Barczewski, Stephanie L. *Myth and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Britain: the Legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood* . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Beckford, William. *Vathek*. Ed. Thomas Keymer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013 (1786).

Bekkaoui, Khalid. "White Women and Moorish Fancy in Eighteenth-Century Literature." Saree Makdisi, Felicity Nussbaum. *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 154-166.

Boyce, Charlotte. ""Mighty through Thy Meats and Drinks Am I": The Gendered Politics of Feast and Fast in Tennyson's Idylls of the King." *Victorian Poetry* 52.2 (2014): 225-249.

Bryden, Inga. "All Dressed Up: Revivalism and the Fashion for Arthur in Victorian Culture." *Arthuriana* 21.2 (2011): 28-41.

Bryden, Inga. "Arthur in Victorian Poetry." Fulton, Helen. *A Companion to Arthurian Literature*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. 368-380.

Burton, Richard. *A plain and literal translation of the Arabian nights' entertainments now entituled The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night*. London: Printed by the Burton Club for private subscribers only, 1885.

Byron, George Gordon Lord. *Lord Byron: The Major Works*. Ed. Jerome J. McGann. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Chandler, Alice. *A Dream of Order: The Medieval Ideal in Nineteenth-Century English Literature*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.

Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu. *Persian Letters*. Cologne: Pierre Martreau, 1721.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. *The Postcolonial Middle Ages*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

Craig, Cairns. "Scott's Staging of the Nation." *Studies in Romanticism* 40.1 (2001): 13-28.

Crookes, Ellie. "'and there She Lete make Herself a Nunne': Guinevere's Afterlife as a Nun in British Culture of the Mid-Nineteenth to Early Twentieth Century." *Arthuriana* 29.1 (2019): 124-147.

Damrosch, David. "What is World Literature?" *World Literature Today* 77.1 (2003): 9-14.

—. *What is World Literature?* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Dobie, Madeleine. "Translation in the Contact Zone: Antoine Galland's Mille et Une Nuits: Contes arabes." Saree Makdisi, Felicity Nussbaum. *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 26-50.

Drury, Annmarie. *Translation as Transformation in Victorian Poetry*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Duncan, Ian. *Scott's Shadow: The Novel in Romantic Edinburgh* . Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Duncan, Ian. "Scott's Romance of the Empire: The Tales of the Crusaders." J.H. Alexander, David Hewitt. *Scott in Carnival: Selected Papers from the Fourth International Scott Conference*. Aberdeen: Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 1993. 370-379.

Ebbatson, Roger. "Knowing the Orient: The Young Tennyson." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 36.2 (2014): 125-134.

Evans, Sebastian. *In the Studio: A Decade of Poems*. London: Macmillan, 1875.

Farhat, Yousef. *Diwan Ibn Zaydun*. Beirut: Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, 1994.

Farrin, Raymond. *Abundance from the Desert: Classical Arabic Poetry*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2011.

Galland, Antoine. *Les Mille et une Nuits: Contes arabes*. Paris, 1726.

Ganim, John M. *Medievalism and Orientalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Graham, Colin. *Ideologies of Epic: Nation, Empire, and Victorian Epic Poetry*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1998.

Griffiths, Devin. "Crossing the Border with Walter Scott." Griffiths, Devin. *The Age of Analogy: Science and Literature between the Darwins* . Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2016.

Grosrichard, Alain. *The Sultan's Court: European Fantasies of the East*. New York: Verso, 1998.

Gubbio, Bosone da. *Aventuroso ciciliano*. Ed. Roberto Gigliucci. Rome: Bulzoni, 1989.

Guest, Charlotte. *The Mabinogion*. London: Longmans, 1835-1845.

Haddad, Emily A. "Tennyson, Arnold, and the Wealth of the East." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 32.2 (2004): 373-391.

Hariri. *Maqamat al-Hariri*. Beirut: Dar al-Sadir lil-Taba'ah wa-al-Nashr, 1965.

Hawker, Robert Stephen. *The Quest of the Sangraal:* . Exeter, 1864.

Heng, Geraldine. *Empire of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Hodgson, Amanda. ""The Highest Poetry": Epic Narrative in "The Earthly Paradise" and "Idylls fo the King"." *Victorian Poetry* 34.3 (1996): 340-354.

Hope, Thomas. *Anastasius* . London: John Murray, 1819.

Irwin, Robert. *The Arabian Nights: A Companion*. London: Allen Lane, 1994.

Jackson-Houlston, C.M. "She Herself Must Venture… beyond the Prescribed Boundary': The Construction of Gender and Cultural Difference through Four Orientalist Fictions." Jackson-Houlston, C.M. *Gendering Walter Scott: Sex, Violence and Romantic Period Writing*. London: Routledge, 2017.

Johnson, Samuel. *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia*. Ed. Thomas Keymer. New York: Oxford World's Classics, 2009.

Kennedy, Hugh. *When Baghdad Ruled the Muslim World: The Rise and Fall of Islam's Greatest Dynasty*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2005.

Kilito, Abdelfattah. *Arabs and the Art of Storytelling: A Strange Familiarity* . Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2014.

Kilito, Abdelfattah. "Is A Thousand and One Nights a Boring Book?" Kilito, Abdelfattah. *Arabs and the Art of Storytelling*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2014. 116-125.

—. *Thou Shalt Not Speak My Language*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2008.

LaFleur, Greta. *The Natural History of Sexuality in Early America*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2018.

Lane, Edward William. *Arabian Society in the Middle Ages: Studies from the Thousand and One Nights*. London: Chatto & WIndus, 1883.

—. *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*. London: Ward, Lock, and Co, 1890.

LaPorte, Charles. *Victorian Poets and the Changing Bible*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011.

Linley, Margaret. "Sexuality and Nationality in Tennyson's 'Idylls of the King'." *Victorian Poetry* 30.3-4 (1992): 365-386.

Loomba, Anni. *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.

Lorretta M. Holloway, Jennifer A. Palmgren. *Beyond Arthurian Romance: The Reach of Victorian Medievalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Ludovico Ariosto, David R. Slavitt. *Orlando Furioso: A New Verse Translation*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009.

Lynch, Andrew. "Nostalgia and Critique: Walter Scott's 'Secret Power'." *Postmedieval: A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies* 2.2 (2011): 201-215.

Lytton, Edward Bulwer. *King Arthur*. London: Henry Colburn, 1848.

Müller-Sievers, Helmut. "Reading Evidence: Textual Criticism as Science in the Nineteenth Century." *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory* 76.2 (2001): 162-171.

Malay, Jessica L. *Prophecy and Sibylline Imagery in the Renaissance: Shakespeare's Sibyls*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2010.

Mallette, Karla. "Reading Backward: The 1001 Nights and Philological Practice." Suzanne Conklin Akbari, Karla Mallette. *A Sea of Languages: Rethinking the Arabic Role in Medieval Literary History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013. 100-116.

Malory, Thomas. *Le Morte Darthur*. Ed. Helen Cooper. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Mancoff, Debra N. *The Return of King Arthur: the Legend through Victorian Eyes*. New York: H.N. Abrams, 1995.

Markovits, Stefanie. *The Victorian Verse-Novel: Aspiring to Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Mas'udi. *Murūj al-Dhahab wa-Ma'ādin al-Jawhar (Meadows of Gold)*. Ed. Muhammad Muhyi al-Din 'Abd al-Hamid. Vol. 4. Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Tijārīyah al-Kubrá, 1958.

Matar, Nabil. *Europe Through Arab Eyes, 1578–1727*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Menocal, María Rosa. *The Arabic Role in Medieval Literary History* . Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.

Monmouth, Geoffrey of. *History of the Kings of Britain*. Ed. Lewis Thorpe. New York: Penguin Books, 1977.

Moore, Thomas. *Lalla Rookh*. New York: Thomse Y. Cromwell & Company, 1817.

Moretti, Franco. "Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* 1 (2000): 54.

—. *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History*. London, New York: Verso, 2007.

—. "More Conjectures." *New Left Review* 20 (2003): 73-81.

Morier, James Justinian. *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan in England*. London: Macmillan and Co, 1828.

Morris, Kevin L. *The Image of the Middle Ages in Romantic and Victorian Literature*. Abingdon: Routledge Press, 2019.

Mufti, Aamir. *Forget English!: Orientalisms and World LIteratures*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016.

Mufti, Aamir R. "Orientalism and the Institution of World Literatures." *Critical Inquiry* 36.3 (2010): 458-493.

Muhsin Mahdi, Hussain Haddawy. *Arabian Nights*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2008.

Mulock, Dina Maria. *Avillion and Other Tales*. London: Smith, Elder, 1853.

Oliver, Susan. "Crossing 'Dark Barriers': Intertextuality and Dialogue between Lord Byron and Sir Walter Scott." *Studies in Romanticism* 47.1 (2008): 15-35.

Parke, H.W. *Greek Oracles*. London: Hutchinson, 1967.

Payne, John. *Tales from the Arabic of the Breslau and Calcutta (1814-18)*. Vol. 3. London: London, 1884.

Pearsall, Cornelia D. J. *Tennyson's Rapture: Transformation in the Victorian Dramatic Monologue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Phelan, Joseph. "Empire and Orientalisms." Bevis, Matthew. *The Oxford Handbook of Victorian Poetry*. Oxford: Oxfurd University Press, 2013. 800-816.

Quint, David. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Ranum, Ingrid. "Tennyson's False Women: Vivien, Guinevere, and the Challenge to Victorian Domestic Ideology." *The Victorian Newsletter* 117 (2010): 39-56.

Reynolds, Matthew. *The Realms of Verse, 1830-1870: English Poetry in a Time of Nation-Building*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Sallis, Eva. *Sheherazade Through the Looking Glass: The Metamorphosis of the Thousand and One Nights* . Abingdon: Routledge, 1990.

Saree Makdisi, Felicity Nausbaum. *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West* . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Scott, Jonathan. *The Arabian Nights Entertainments, Carefully Revised, and Occasionally Corrected from the Arabic*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1811.

Scott, Walter. *Ivanhoe*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2000.

—. *The Surgeon's Daughter*. Edinburgh: Cadell and Co., 1827.

—. *The Talisman*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Sercambi, Giovanni. *Novelle*. 1368-1424.

Sheridan, Frances. *The History of Nourjahad*. London: J. Dodsley, 1767.

Simeone, William E. "The Robin Hood of Ivanhoe." *The Journal of American Folklore* 74.293 (1961): 230-234.

Simmons, Claire A. *Reversing the Conquest: History and Myth in Nineteenth-Century British Literature*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Simpson, David. "'Which Is the Merchant Here? and Which the Jew?": Friends and Enemies in Walter Scott's Crusader Novel." *Studies in Romanticism* 47.4 (2008): 437-452.

Southey, Robert. *Thalaba the Destroyer*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1809.

Stubbs, William. *The Constitutional History of England, in Its Origin and Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Suzanne Conklin Akbari, Karla Mallette. *A Sea of Languages: Rethinking the Arabic Role in Medieval Literary History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Tennyson, Alfred. *Idylls of the King*. Ed. J.M. Gray. New York: Penguin Classics, 1989.

Tennyson, Alfred. "Locksley Hall." Tennyson, Alfred. *Tennyson: A Selected Edition*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006. 181-192.

Tennyson, Alfred. "Recollections of the Arabian Nights." Tennyson, Alfred. *Poems, Chiefly Lyrical*. London: Effingham Wilson, 1830.

—. *Tennyson: A Selected Edition*. Ed. Christopher Ricks. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

Thomas, Patrick Henry. "Sir Walter Scott and the Transgression of Anachronistic Borders: The Ideological Fantasy of Westphalian Sovereignty in The Talisman." *European Romantic Review* 28.2 (2017): 203-225.

Thomas, the Rhymer. *The Romance and Prophecies of Thomas of Erceldoune: Printed from Five Manuscripts; with illustrations from the prophetic literature of the 15th and 16th centuries*. London: N. Trübner & Co., 1875.

Troyes, Chrétien de. *Arthurian Romances*. Ed. Carleton W. Carroll William W. Kibler. New York: Penguin Classics, 2004.

Turner, Benedick. "A Man's Work must She do: Female Manliness in Tennyson's Gareth and Lynette." *Victorian Poetry* 52.3 (2014): 483-507.

Tzoref-Ashkenazi, Chen. "Romantic Attitudes toward Oriental Despotism." *The Journal of Modern History* 85.2 (2013): 280-320.

Vitkus, David J. *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Wallace, Tara Ghoshal G. "Monarchy and the Middle-Period Novels." Robertson, Fiona. *The Edinburgh Companion to Walter Scott*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012. 106-117.

Watt, James. "Scott, the Scottish Enlightenment, and Romantic Orientalism." Leith Davis, Ian Duncan, Janet Sorenson. *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 94-112.

Weber, Henry. *Tales of the East*. Edinburgh: James Ballantyne & Company, 1812.

Weil, Gustav. *Tausend und eine Nacht*. Berlin: Neufeld & Henius, 1914.

Wenzel, Jennifer. *The Disposition of Nature: Environmental Crisis and World Literature*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2019.

White, Simon J. "Ivanhoe, Robin Hood and the Pentridge Rising." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 31.3 (2009): 209-224.

Yousef, Nisreen Tawfiq. "Walter Scott and the Islamic East: Ivanhoe and the Talisman." *Journal of English and Literature* 9.1 (2018): 758.

Zaman, Saifuz. "The Edification of Sir Walter Scott's Saladin in The Talisman." *Studies in Literature and Language* 1.8 (2010): 39-46.