

National Philology, Imperial Hierarchies, and the ‘Defective’ *Book of Sir John*

Mandeville

Abstract This article examines when and how the ‘Defective’ version of the *Book of Sir John Mandeville* came to be called ‘defective’. It describes the use of this name by Sir George F. Warner in an edition produced in 1889 for the elite bibliographic society the Roxburghe Club. Drawing on recent work in disability studies, it argues that the philological use of ‘defective’ be read in conjunction with its broader use in the elaboration of hierarchies of class, race, and gender. Far from a neutral descriptor, ‘defective’ provides a compelling example of the imbrication of medieval studies, imperialism, and Social Darwinist principles in the late nineteenth century. The article closes with the call not only to rename the ‘Defective’ version the ‘Common’ version, but also for a broader reappraisal of this apparently discrete version of Mandeville’s *Book*. However, it also argues that amid the increasing marketisation of higher education and the concomitant insecurity of academic labour, digital editing does not provide a straightforward answer to the question of how best to map and display the complex textual history of Mandeville’s *Book*.

The practice of philology in the nineteenth century is now well recognised for its political investments. Concepts like textual ‘descent,’ ‘purity,’ and ‘corruption’ were frequently used to reduce complex cultural and literary histories into a simpler national, and often overtly nationalist, story. In so doing, these concepts replicated normative discourses in the allied fields of biology, anthropology, and linguistics that supported European colonialism. The stemmatic editing primarily associated with Karl Lachmann (1793-1851) has been the focus

for critiques of textual bibliography's positivism, as well as of the patriarchal and heteronormative assumptions gathered under the editorial paradigm of textual 'dissemination'. By grouping manuscripts into 'families' according to shared scribal errors, stemmatics looks to reconstruct an authorial archetype, a supposedly 'purer' form of the literary work uncorrupted by its passage through the all-too-fallible hands of later scribes.¹ Joseph Bédier's (1864-1934) 'best text' editorial theory offers another form of 'purity', replete with its own moralistic discourse of the 'truth' of certain manuscripts over the ahistorical text constructed by stemmatic editing.²

Editorial methods established in the nineteenth century remain influential and highly regarded. Of course, alternative approaches have also flourished since the late twentieth century. The 'sociology of the text' elaborated by D. F. McKenzie and Jerome J. McGann sought to re-embed texts in their contexts of production and consumption, in opposition both to formalism's idealising tendencies and the positivism underwriting bibliography and textual criticism.³ Paul Zumthor's and Bernard Cerquiglini's influential accounts of textual *mouvance* and *variance* respectively have prompted scholars to turn to descriptions of textual 'instability' and 'fluidity'.⁴ More recently, the field has benefitted from approaches that connect textual criticism and book history with the interpretive provocations offered by contemporary critical theory.⁵ Still, stemmatics and its downward-branching trees of textual 'descent' continue to occupy an important role in a field deeply invested in the search for textual origins and in the patriarchal, masculinist framing of philology and codicology as the study of '(conflicting) relations' between manuscripts.⁶ And nineteenth-century textual categories and metaphors live on, deeply embedded as they are in the foundation of the discipline and in long-lived and conservative ideas of what constitutes legitimate, rigorous scholarly labour. The 'fragments' of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*—the editorial creation of

Henry Bradshaw and Frederick Furnivall in the 1860s—provide perhaps the best example of the endurance of nineteenth-century textual metaphors.⁷

The ideological foundations and political uses of philological study during the nineteenth century have been the subject of close attention, as part of what Julie Orlemanski describes as a vigorous recent “metaphilological” conversation that has been unfolding in literary studies...informed by practical knowledge of philological work and by a densely realized critical historicism’.⁸ In this vein, Michelle R. Warren writes of how the ‘national epics’ in particular—*Beowulf* in England, the *Nibelungenlied* in Germany, *El Cid* in Spain, and the *Chanson de Roland* in France—were understood to ‘legitimate the ethnic identities of modern nation-states’, in a period of social and political upheaval within Europe and imperial expansion by a number of European nations.⁹

Tracing the ideological uses of the medieval period’s cultural and linguistic archive is a project with additional significance in the wake of recent high-profile appropriations of the Middle Ages by right-wing nationalist and fascist groups across Europe and North America. At the ‘Unite the Right’ rally in Charlottesville, Virginia in August 2017, appropriated medieval symbols were displayed alongside Confederate flags. In Europe, similar attempts ‘to lay claim to medieval history as the unique property of the far right’ characterise not only the English Defence League and other extreme-right fringe groups, but also Marine Le Pen’s Rassemblement national and Victor Orbán’s Fidesz party in Hungary.¹⁰ The former is now one of the main opposition parties in France, while the latter has been in government since 2010, in which time it has enacted a wide range of socially regressive and ethnonationalist policies. As Dorothy Kim forcefully argues, medievalists have an obligation not only to address and directly counter these appropriations in their classrooms, but also to account for the complicity of the field of medieval studies in the foundation and consolidation of

nationalism and theories of white racial and cultural superiority since the nineteenth century.¹¹

Within these linked disciplinary, ideological, and political frameworks, the English manuscripts of the *Book of Sir John Mandeville* are an exemplary case of the enduring influence and effects of nineteenth-century philology. As Anthony Bale writes, the ‘hierarchical, evolution-driven language of a chain or line of “descent”...has dominated studies of Mandeville, which have largely pursued an author-figure and the text’s origins’.¹² However, and as Bale’s work also attests, critical interest in the *Book* over roughly the last three decades has opened new perspectives that challenge normative paradigms. First, scholars have developed a clearer understanding of and appreciation for the *Book*’s remarkable textual plurality across and within multiple languages.¹³ Second, the *Book* has played a significant, though by no means straightforward, role in the critical turn toward postcolonial theory in medieval literary studies and the efforts of numerous medievalists to describe and to teach a complexly *global* Middle Ages.¹⁴

The *Book* begins by describing itself as an account of its English author’s travels across Latin Christendom to Jerusalem. It soon looks beyond this initial pilgrimage frame, though, as Mandeville details the routes that a prospective traveller might take

thorgh Turky and Surry [Syria], Hermony [Armenia] the Lasse and the More, Tartari, Perce [Persia], Arabie, Egipte the Heigh and the Lowe, Libie [Libya], Caldee [Chaldea], and a greet party of Ethiope, Amazayn [Amazonia], and a greet partye of Inde the More and the Lasse, and thorgh many other iles that beth aboute Inde, wher that dwelleth many diverse folk of maneris and diverse lawes and shappes (62-66)¹⁵

The *Book* is punctuated by accounts of Mandeville's ostensible deeds—his military service for the Great Khan (2009), and his journey through the 'Valey Perlous' (2495), for example—but it is also replete with inset narratives he claims to have heard, accounts of locations he was not able to visit (most notably the site of Noah's Ark on Mount Ararat and the Earthly Paradise), and alternative routes that could be taken. The world the *Book* describes is capacious, a world 'sillonnée de routes, routes terrestres ou maritimes, qui sont autant d'invitations au voyage' [furrowed by routes, both land and sea routes, that are also invitations to travel] in Christiane Deluz's deft description.¹⁶ The *Book* is not so much a travelogue, as a compendium of possible routes that 'whoso wole passe over the see' might follow (73). I therefore follow Iain M. Higgins's designation of the text as the *Book of John Mandeville*, rather than *Mandeville's Travels*, leaving open 'the question of what kind of book this might be'.¹⁷

A medieval 'bestseller', the *Book* survives in around 300 manuscripts and fragments, and in all the major European languages of the late Middle Ages. The *Book* spread rapidly after its initial appearance around the middle of the fourteenth century and would exercise 'an authoritative impact on how the world and its peoples should be viewed for two and a half centuries', in Geraldine Heng's description.¹⁸ Since the late nineteenth century, though, one version of Mandeville's *Book* in particular has been circumscribed by editorial theory's investment in the 'purest' or 'best' texts. The so-called 'Defective' version in English is defined by a lacuna in the text that likely resulted from a missing gathering of leaves in the French manuscript source. Formalised in the late nineteenth century, this designation has proven enduring, even as an increasing number of critics resort to scare quotes to signal their discomfort with its pejorative connotations.

The largely neglected story of when and how the 'Defective' *Book of Mandeville* came to be called 'defective' provides an arresting example of what Warren describes as 'the

ideological values of the products of nineteenth-century philology'.¹⁹ I trace the immediate context of this name's use in the pages of an edition edited by Sir George F. Warner (1845-1936) and published by the elite bibliographic society the Roxburghe Club. In *How Soon is Now?*, Carolyn Dinshaw examines the 'intimate relationship between philology and British colonial enterprise in South Asia' visible in studies of and responses to Mandeville's *Book* during the late 1880s by Sir Henry Yule, Andrew Lang, and M. R. James.²⁰ Warner's edition provides a striking further instance of the imbrication, via Mandeville's *Book*, of philology, medievalism, and imperialism in the last decades of the nineteenth century. In turn, I draw on recent work in disability studies in order to examine how the designation of a group of manuscripts as 'defective' was underwritten by the essentialising pseudoscientific abstractions of Social Darwinism. Textual bibliography and Social Darwinism shared a deep disciplinary and ideological investment in the elaboration of hierarchies and genealogies, and in the construction of a national corpus purged, as far as was practicable, of its 'defective' elements.

I Mandeville at large

Originally composed in French around 1355—whether Anglo-Norman or Continental French remains the subject of some debate—Mandeville's *Book* was soon translated into ten other vernacular languages and into Latin.²¹ The *Book*'s playful and often ironic sense of *auctoritas*, its inchoate sense of its readership(s), and its paratactic structure in which narrative units are often linked by measurements of distance from one location to the next, also made it particularly open to various forms of alteration and addition. Just as the world it describes provides numerous invitations to travel, the *Book* provided numerous invitations for

later scribes and redactors not just to translate, but also to significantly rework the material before them.

The *Book*'s openness to translation, addition, and alteration has led scholars to identify more than twenty discrete 'Versions' of the text.²² The Anglo-Norman text (commonly referred to as the 'Insular' version in Mandeville scholarship) was the basis for the four main English versions: 'Cotton', 'Egerton', 'Bodley', and 'Defective'. While the Cotton and Egerton versions each survive in a single manuscript and the versified Bodley version in just two, manuscripts of the so-called 'Defective' version were circulating widely in England in the late fourteenth century and into the fifteenth. Thirty-three manuscripts and seven fragments survive, likely making it one of the most widely read version of Mandeville's *Book*, alongside Michael Vesler's and Otto von Diemeringen's German versions and the 'Latin Vulgate' version.²³

The 'Defective' version is, in Bale's description, 'amongst the most economical and readable versions of Mandeville's *Book*': it largely follows the Anglo-Norman text, though it condenses many passages and also omits some of the more 'strident' material on crusading at the beginning of the text.²⁴ However, it has come to be defined by the absence of a sizeable portion of Mandeville's account of Egypt and Sicily early in the text. This absence is commonly known in scholarship as the 'Egypt gap'. It likely results from a missing quire in the manuscript of the Anglo-Norman text from which it was translated; alongside a handful of other smaller gaps and absences, the 'Egypt gap' remains the defining characteristic of this apparently discrete 'Version' of the text.

The 'Defective' version was the basis for all the initial print editions of the *Book* in England, with Richard Pynson's 1496 copy of a now-lost 'Defective' manuscript printed at least twenty-two times. This early print history was closely interwoven with the initial stages of British colonialism—periods of 'intensified publication' of Mandeville's *Book* coincided

with or closely followed John Cabot's voyage (1497), Francis Drake's circumnavigation (1577-80), and the granting of a charter to the East India Company (1600).²⁵

The publication in 1725 of the text preserved in London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus C. xvi (the Cotton version) marks a significant turning point in the textual history of Mandeville's *Book* in England. The Cotton version, like the Egerton version (British Library, Egerton MS 1982), does not have an 'Egypt gap'. It is possible that the makers of the Cotton and Egerton versions both worked from a 'Defective' manuscript, before restoring the long missing section through comparison with a manuscript of another version of the text. However, the precise relationship and relative priority between the 'Defective', 'Cotton', and 'Egerton' versions remains unclear.²⁶

The Cotton version also includes a number of unique interpolations, including a passage presenting the text as an authorial translation: 'I haue put this boke out of latyn in to Frensch & translated it ayen out of frensch in to Englysch,' the Mandeville of the Cotton version states, so that 'euery man of my nacioun may vnderstonde it'.²⁷ From the late nineteenth century until well into the twentieth, critics would largely regard this version as an authoritative stand-in for the authorial text, even as they occasionally made reference to the *Book*'s textual multiplicity.²⁸ Paul Hamelius's Early English Text Society edition of the Cotton manuscript was published in two volumes in 1919 and 1923 and remains among the most commonly cited Middle English versions of Mandeville's *Book*.

The increasingly detailed and formalised tracing of the distinct versions of Mandeville's *Book* in the second half of the nineteenth century dovetailed with a more fundamental discovery: scholars exhaustively confirmed that the text was a collage of material assembled from the work of others, rather than the first-hand account it claims to be. Scepticism of Mandeville was not new—from the sixteenth century, editors, publishers, and readers had called the *Book*'s veracity into question, even as it had been prized as a valuable

source of information on a range of topics. However, under what Dinshaw calls the ‘probing philological eyes’ of its nineteenth-century critics, the *Book*’s sources became the subject of forensic study and the ‘true’ identity of its author a scholarly problem to untangle.²⁹ As a result, a complex and ambivalent relationship to Mandeville and his *Book* is visible in the work of scholars in England in the last decades of the nineteenth century. The long history of the *Book* in print and manuscript, its significant place in the history of English prose, and its role as a medieval precursor to British colonialism were counterbalanced by what Sir George F. Warner describes as Mandeville’s ‘fraud and mendacity’ in passing off the work of others as his own.³⁰

II Warner’s Mandeville

In the introduction to his 1889 edition of the unique English text preserved in British Library, MS Egerton 1982 (the Egerton version), Warner writes admiringly of how the long-serving colonial administrator and philologist Sir Henry Yule had ‘disposed once and for all of Mandeville’s pretensions to be regarded, at least to any extent, as an authentic and veracious traveller’. Warner goes on to write that in his explanatory notes to the text he has ‘endeavoured to complete and press home the indictment by...tracing every passage, so far as possible, to its actual source in some earlier writer’.³¹

It is also here—in the introduction to his edition of the more complete Egerton text and amidst his thoroughgoing attempt to expose the full extent of Mandeville’s ‘fraud’—that Warner uses ‘defective’ to designate the group of manuscripts missing a sizeable portion of Sir John’s account of Egypt and Sicily. In their 1883 *Encyclopedia Britannica* entry for ‘Jehan de Mandeville’, Yule and E. B. Nicholson describe the French manuscript from which the English text was translated as ‘defective’, and later refer to Pynson’s edition as of the

‘defective shape’.³² Warner formalises ‘defective’ as the name for this apparently discrete version of the text. ‘All the manuscripts of this defective English text are of the 15th cent., and the date of the translation is open to doubt,’ Warner writes and on the following page he refers again to this group ‘which I will call D.’.³³ For Warner, this group of manuscripts is the result of a sequence of failures and missteps, perpetrated by scribes either too careless or foolish to see the incompleteness of what they found before them: the ‘defective’ text results from a ‘mutilated archetype’, but its translator ‘must have been extraordinarily obtuse, and subsequent copyists no less so, not to have perceived that leaves were missing’.³⁴ Here, Warner’s descriptive term and its accompanying explanation indicate, is a group of manuscripts with an inherited flaw that are not worthy of further critical discussion or physical reproduction. ‘Defective’ intimates the overbearing moralism of nineteenth-century textual criticism, as well as its tendency towards the essentialising, even arbitrary classification of manuscripts according to a limited number of characteristics.

As a respected palaeographer and ‘Assistant-Keeper of Manuscripts’ at the British Museum from 1888 until 1901, Warner played an important role in the professionalization of medieval studies in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Like his other critical editions and manuscript catalogues, Warner’s *Mandeville* is a monument to scholarly endeavour. The carefully edited text and extensive introduction, explanatory notes, and glossary remain a valuable resource for scholars. It is Warner’s ‘beautifully produced’ edition of the Egerton manuscript from which Geraldine Heng quotes in her influential account of Mandeville’s *Book* as a ‘romance of travel’, for example.³⁵ Warner’s edition also includes, at the foot of each page, the ‘Insular’ text from British Library, MS Harley 4383 (with the text of British Library, MS Royal 20 B.x replacing the lost second half of Harley 4383), a particularly useful addition for scholars interested in the relationship between the Anglo-Norman and Middle English versions of the *Book*. The text and explanatory notes are followed by

facsimiles of twenty-eight miniatures illustrating Mandeville's account from London, British Library, MS Additional 24189.

Yet Warner's edition also makes plain his connections to the British ruling class and an existing order of elite medievalism. It was produced for the Roxburghe Club, the oldest and, in its own words, 'most distinguished society devoted to printing unpublished documents and reprinting rare printed texts'.³⁶ With membership limited to forty on a strict invitation-only basis and print-runs of between sixty and one hundred copies of its editions, the Roxburghe Club was, and remains, an organisation defined by selectivity and privilege.³⁷ Frederick Furnivall edited three texts for the Roxburghe Club in the early 1860s, yet as William Benzie writes in his study of Furnivall's life and career, it 'was hardly the place for democratic Furnivall, from either a social or a publishing standpoint'.³⁸ Furnivall founded the Early English Text Society in 1864, in order to produce books aimed at a wider audience, as well as to furnish material for the *New English Dictionary* (later to become the *OED*).³⁹

As was tradition, the first leaf of Warner's edition after the title page is given over to a grand list of the Club's current membership: a rollcall of Earls, Dukes, and Lords, followed by the names of the non-aristocratic members (**Figs. 1 and 2**). Read alongside its sizeable proportions and deluxe materials, the list of Warner's patrons and peers medievalizes his edition, which in many ways more closely resembles a medieval display manuscript than the critical editions being produced by the Early English Text Society.

[Fig. 1 – Title page © British Library Board (*The Buke of John Maundevill*, not paginated, Document Supply AfD72/27712)]

[Fig. 2 – List of members of the Roxburghe Club © British Library Board (*The Buke of John Maundevill*, not paginated, Document Supply AfD72/27712)]

It is impossible to read this list of members without being struck by the resonances between the *Book's* account of an English knight's ostensible travels across the globe and the contemporary political circumstances in which many of them held significant influence and power. Edward Stanley, Earl of Derby, had been the first Secretary of State for India when the post was created in 1858 and was Secretary of State for the Colonies between 1882 and 1885. Henry Herbert, Earl of Carnarvon, had twice served as Secretary of State for the Colonies and had been Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from 1885 to 1886. Robert Gascoyne-Cecil, Marquess of Salisbury, was in his second spell as Prime Minister in 1889, having earlier been Secretary of State for India (1866-67 and 1874-78) and Foreign Secretary (1878-80).

As Mike Davis traces in detail, Salisbury played a key role in the British response to the El Niño droughts that ravaged India between 1876 and 1878 and 1888 and 1902. This was a response in which 'Malthusian principles, updated by Social Darwinism, were regularly invoked to legitimize Indian famine policy at home in England'.⁴⁰ As droughts endured and crops failed repeatedly in many parts of the country, Salisbury and his fellow colonial administrators insisted on a crude and racist form of Utilitarianism. Policies implemented in Ireland in the 1840s and 50s were repeated in India, with Adam Smith's theory of the 'invisible hand' of the market at the core of British refusals to implement price controls on food or distribute relief. In many parts of the country, food prices spiked, and stores of wheat and rice languished in padlocked silos or were exported to Britain, as Indian farmers and peasants starved to death.⁴¹

The name of Arthur James Balfour is equally striking, in the paratext of a work that records multiples routes across the Mediterranean and Egypt and to Jerusalem. In 1889, Balfour was an MP, but he was soon to serve a brief, fraught term as Prime Minister. In 1916, he returned to government in the role of foreign secretary. The following year, Balfour wrote

on behalf of the British government via Lord Rothschild to the Zionist Federation, declaring its support for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. The Balfour Declaration, as it would come to be known, was fundamentally shaped by Britain's 'imperial interests' at the time, particularly the maintenance of control over the nearby Suez Canal, the vital sea route between the metropole and British India and the east coast of Africa.⁴²

The Canal opened in 1869 and quickly became vital to trade between Europe, Asia, East Africa, and Australia. In 1875, then British prime minister Benjamin Disraeli bought a major shareholding in the Canal for £4 million. Amid growing inter-imperialist rivalry with France and Germany, both of which were seeking to extend their influence in the Near East, Britain invaded Egypt in 1882; British troops would remain in the country until 1956. The Suez Canal was central to the 'New Imperialism' cultivated in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, as imperial powers fought for control over trade monopolies, emergent markets, and natural resources. This was a period, Davis writes, during which the 'labour and products' of Britain's colonial possessions, and of India in particular, 'were being dynamically conscripted into a London-centred world economy'.⁴³ Ideological and intellectual justifications for British colonialism had looked to the work of Thomas More, Walter Grotius, and John Locke, among others. In line with its ostensibly modernising impulses, justification for the New Imperialism was 'augmented by notions of racial and cultural superiority blended with quasi-scientific rationalisations mobilised in justification of colonial political practice'.⁴⁴

To be clear, my argument is not that the *Book* served as some kind of guide to world domination for the members of the Roxburghe Club. Rather, it is that to read Mandeville's *Book* in Warner's edition is to confront the imbrication of a burgeoning medieval studies, an elite medievalism, and the geopolitics of the New Imperialism. If the 'Egypt gap' is the defining characteristic of the 'Defective' *Book*, then Warner's pejorative name and his

decision to edit the more complete Egerton text take on additional contemporary significance. After all, if there is any section of an English version of Mandeville's *Book* that its readers in the Roxburghe Club would not want it to be missing, it would likely be the section describing *Egypt*, the country Britain had invaded and occupied in 1882, and which would become increasingly vital to the maintenance and expansion of its empire as the nineteenth century drew to a close.

What Dinshaw calls the 'intimate relationship' between the colonial present and the philological recovery of the medieval past pervades Warner's edition.⁴⁵ In his introduction, for example, Warner notes how Mandeville's *Book* evinces the 'love of travel which...already characterised the English race' in the late medieval period.⁴⁶ For all his criticism of Mandeville's plagiarism and 'mendacity', Warner cannot help but see his *Book* as a precursor to British imperialism, euphemistically described as a 'love of travel', and defined not as the result of astrological influence, as it is by Mandeville, but as an enduring *racial* characteristic. This is not the only occasion on which Warner argues for a strong contemporary significance for medieval materials. His 1926 edition of *The Libelle of Englysche Polycye* (1426/7), which argues stridently for the importance of English naval control over the seas around Britain, remains the most recent critical edition of the poem. While acknowledging that the poem is relatively limited in its geographic reach, Warner nevertheless describes its author's 'arguments' that Britain's 'road to prosperity and greatness' lay in the command of the seas as 'no less applicable to altered circumstances with a far wider scope', and suggests that 'his wisdom and foresight have been amply confirmed during the five centuries which have since elapsed'.⁴⁷

As I outline above, Warner's explanatory notes to the *Book* remain a significant scholarly resource, particularly for their identification of Mandeville's numerous medieval sources.⁴⁸ Less frequently discussed is Warner's invocation of a number of contemporary

writers, many of whom had played significant roles in British colonial expansion and governance. Warner makes reference to Sir Henry Yule's expertise on the geography of south east Asia, amassed during his long career in Bengal and Burma.⁴⁹ Capt. Claude Reignier Conder's 1878 *Tent Work in Palestine: A Record of Discovery and Adventure* provides Warner with additional material for his notes on Mandeville's account of Jerusalem and the Levant. Between 1875 and 1878, Conder was seconded to the Palestine Exploration Fund, an organization whose historical, biblical, and archaeological research was closely linked to British military and colonial interests in the area.⁵⁰ In his note to Mandeville's account of the 'the sepulchre of our Lord' and the miracle of the Holy Fire, for example, Warner records that Conder's book provides a vivid contemporary account of the annual festival celebrating the latter.⁵¹ He then approvingly quotes Conder's claim that while "every educated Greek knows it to be a shameful imposition...the ignorant Syrians and the fanatical Russian peasants still believe the fire to descend from heaven".⁵²

Similarly, in his note to Mandeville's account of the 'meruile' of the great shoals of fish found in 'Calanok', Warner quotes a long passage from Francis H. H. Guillemard's 1886 *The Cruise of the Marchesa to Kamschatka and New Guinea*, in which Guillemard describes a similar occurrence on the Kamchatka Peninsula in present-day Russia.⁵³ Warner then draws on Sir James Emerson Tennent's *Sketches of the Natural History of Ceylon* (1861) in his notes to Mandeville's account of 'Silha' (Ceylon, present-day Sri Lanka). Tennent served as Colonial Secretary to Ceylon from 1846 to 1850, before returning to Britain to become an MP and permanent secretary to the Board of Trade. Mandeville records the use of 'pe ius of pe fruyt pat es called lymons' to ward off leeches; Warner, referencing Tennent, notes that 'for the bites of [leeches] the natives still use lemon juice, not only to stop the flow of blood, but to expedite the healing of the wound'.⁵⁴

Carolyn Dinshaw examines how Victorian readers of the *Book* with ‘their own investments in the East—as members of the British Empire...relied on an Orientalist valuation of movement east, maintaining that West had progressed while the East had not’; this was an Orientalism that ‘correlated the book’s eastward progress with the expansion of the British Empire’.⁵⁵ Warner’s dense explanatory notes clearly differ in genre, purpose, and tone to those texts examined in detail by Dinshaw: Andrew Lang’s hectoring 1886 ‘letter’ to ‘Sir John Mandeville [*sic*] Kt.’ and M. R. James’s 1887 short parody in which the narrator, a philologist, claims to have discovered a lost chapter of the *Book*.⁵⁶ At the same time, though, visible in Warner’s notes is not only his exacting scholarly attention to Mandeville’s sources, but also an Orientalism that ambivalently equates travel east with travel backwards in time.

III The ‘defective’ classes

The ‘intimate relationship’ between imperialist present and medieval past provides the broader context for Warner’s use of ‘defective’ to demarcate the version of Mandeville’s *Book* that he has decided *not* to edit for his patrons in the Roxburghe Club, but which lurks at the edges of his more complete text.⁵⁷ It is important to note at this point that Yule and Nicholson’s encyclopedia entry and Warner’s introduction demonstrate the existing use of ‘defective’ in nineteenth century philology, a use which endures in textual criticism, particularly of the Bible.⁵⁸ This use recalls not only English and Latin grammar books of the sixteenth century, which often use ‘defective’ to describe verbs with an incomplete conjugation, but also that of medieval scribes, who used *deficit* (‘it is absent’) and *defectus* to mark passages where material appeared to be missing from their exemplar. The scribe of London, British Library, MS Harley 1758, a copy of Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*, for example, uses ‘deficit’ to note passages where individual lines are absent.⁵⁹ In this sense,

‘defective’ provided a suitable addition to the self-consciously Latinate technical vocabulary deployed by textual critics in the second half of the nineteenth century. As Karla Mallette notes, Lachmannian textual critics in particular ‘devised a technical vocabulary, a chorus of plummy Latin words designating phenomena and activities peculiar to the textual critic’s work: stemma codicum, textus receptus, edition princeps, recensio’.⁶⁰

Yet Warner’s ‘defective’ also directs us toward the ways in which editorial discourses and metaphors come to participate in, and be underwritten by, broader ideological and political formations. For in deploying this adjective to delineate a group of manuscripts with a critical, shared flaw, Warner’s introduction contributes to the exchange between textual criticism and the Social Darwinism associated with Francis Galton during the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth.

Galton’s work was influential in numerous political and academic spheres, and particularly in textual criticism, deeply invested as both fields are in ideas of both ‘purity’ and ‘degeneracy’. In his chapter on ‘textual eugenics’, Joseph Grigely traces the broader ‘parallels between eugenic ideology and editorial practices’ that emerged in the last decades of the nineteenth century, with particular reference to Galton’s work.⁶¹ Qualitative descriptions of a text’s ‘degeneration’ were not new in the late nineteenth century, but as Grigely emphasises, textual criticism’s scientism was not ‘abstract, or honorific’. Rather, textual criticism was framed in terms of ‘particular conceptions of science: biology and pathology’.⁶² Grigely focuses primarily on textual emendation and the claims of editors to have produced a ‘superior’ form of a literary work through the identification and treatment of its textual ‘symptoms’ (that is, its scribal errors).⁶³ The ‘Defective’ *Book of Mandeville* provides a good example of the counterpart to this process: the isolation of a certain group deemed ‘incurable’ due to a particular shared characteristic and editorial advocacy against its circulation and reproduction. The scientism of this approach—and of nineteenth-century

textual bibliography more generally—is neatly condensed in Warner’s abbreviated ‘D’.

Through the identification of a shared inherited flaw, an otherwise heterogeneous group of extant manuscripts become a clearly defined, and therefore manageable, ‘defective class’.⁶⁴

Recent work in the history of disability provides the means to dig deeper into the use of ‘defective’ in the late nineteenth century, and to trace in further detail the links between Social Darwinism, philology, and medievalism. The *Middle English Dictionary* attests to the use of ‘defectif’ to denote a general sense of faultiness, as well as immorality or sinfulness when applied to people.⁶⁵ Yet as Douglas C. Baynton examines, by the last decades of the nineteenth century, and particularly in the wake of Galton’s work, ‘defective’ and ‘defect’ ‘in most usages corresponded closely to what we would now mean by disability’.⁶⁶ Deafness, blindness, and various forms of mobility impairment were classed as ‘defects’, yet individuals considered to be ‘defective’ could also include

people with curved spines, hernias, flat or club feet, missing limbs, and short limbs; those who were unusually short or tall; people with intellectual or psychiatric disabilities; hermaphrodites (intersexuals); men of ‘poor physique’ and men diagnosed with ‘feminism’—a hormonal deficiency, relatively common at the time, that caused underdeveloped sexual organs⁶⁷

Further, alongside a wide range of physical and mental conditions, ‘defect’ also encompassed ‘moral defect’, as part of ‘an attempt to move beyond the language of sin and to explain deviant, criminal, and other socially unacceptable behaviors in biological terms’.⁶⁸

Changing ideas about historical time in the second half of the nineteenth century played a significant role in these updated and ostensibly scientific theories of ‘degeneracy’ and ‘defect’. The long durations opened up by evolutionary biology and new studies of the

earth's geology were accompanied by a heightened sense of everyday time as a result of rapid industrialization and a largely unregulated market economy. Both of these revised understandings of time could be channelled through the figure of the 'defective', who was framed by many adherents of Social Darwinism as unproductive and therefore burdensome in an immediate social and economic context, but also as a troubling portent for the evolutionary future of humanity, if deliberate actions were not taken in the present.⁶⁹

Importantly, 'defect' strongly implied heritability, a topic that was central not only to contemporary pseudoscience, but also to the work of European historians and philologists who sought to trace the 'origin of a continuous civilization that led to the present of the nineteenth century'.⁷⁰ From the late nineteenth century, a wide range of 'characteristics, strengths, weaknesses, and tendencies' were considered to be heritable.⁷¹ 'Defectiveness' was therefore deeply and complexly interwoven not only with the politics of disability and class, but also with pseudoscientific theories of race, particularly because some 'defects' were held to be more prevalent in certain races than in others. Baynton focuses primarily on American immigration policy at the turn of the twentieth century as one arena in which Social Darwinist 'selection' was carried out, but his study conveys a more general impression of how 'undesirable races...were understood to be those in which defects proliferated. Immorality, criminality, deviant sexuality, poverty, and political radicalism were all described as manifestations of various kinds of mental defect'.⁷²

It was in this context that a 'purified medievalism' and contemporary pseudoscience provided mutually reinforcing stories of racial, physical, and social superiority: what Amy Kaufmann describes as the 'reassuring fiction of genetic aristocracy in which one's power naturally equalled one's virtue' dovetailed with Social Darwinism's supposedly scientific account of how physical and moral 'virtue' and 'defect' alike 'adhered to bloodlines'.⁷³ However, theories of 'defect' also presented a troubling threat to the future of the nation, as it

was thought that ‘defects’ were not only heritable but also mutable, and that this mutability might have unforeseen, even disastrous consequences in future generations. That is, while ‘defect’ implied a sense of fixity and inevitability to existing social and political formations, it also intimated a potentially very different future, if ‘defectives’ were not demarcated and managed appropriately in the present.⁷⁴

As Baynton’s study makes clear, theories of ‘defectiveness’ looked anxiously both forward and backward in time: backward to the supposed origins of the white European ‘races’ in the Middle Ages and forward to the future of an improved nation and, especially in Britain’s case, empire. Galton and his followers often wrote with reference to a generalised sense of ‘human progress’, but the essentialising abstractions and racisms of Social Darwinism were primarily articulated at the level of the nation and as an avowedly nationalistic project.⁷⁵ Britain was still a hegemonic imperial power at the close of the nineteenth century. However, it was also a nation beset by domestic political unrest in the wake of the Charterist movements of the 1840s and 50s, the Reform Acts of the 1830s, 60s and 80s, and the increasing influence of Marxist and Socialist movements across Europe. Equally significant was the escalating opposition to colonial rule in Ireland, India and South East Asia, and across Africa.⁷⁶ These struggles provide the broader context in which the rhetorical and iconographic elucidation of ‘defectiveness’ became a central element in the British ruling class’s attempts ‘to mediate...the manifold contradictions in imperial hierarchy’ that were becoming increasingly apparent by the close of the century.⁷⁷ As Anne McClintock writes, the ‘defective’ or ‘degenerate’ classes—domestic and colonial alike—‘were collectively figured as racial deviants, atavistic throwbacks to a primitive moment in human prehistory, surviving ominously in the heart of the modern, imperial metropolis’.⁷⁸

What Grigely describes as the ‘parallels between eugenic ideology and editorial practices’ are clear: ‘concerns about both antecedents and future states [are] paramount’ to

both.⁷⁹ In the case of Warner's use of 'defective', though, Grigely's 'parallel' does not fully capture what I have come to think of as the 'convergence' or 'conjunction' of philology, nationalism, colonialism, disability, and Social Darwinism, in the scholarly history of a text closely tied to the history of empire and to the idea of a distinct 'English race' characterized by its 'love of travel'.⁸⁰ In addressing this history, I have been conscious of Kathleen Biddick's critique, now over two decades old, of the attempts of scholars 'to distance medieval studies, not from the techniques' and their origins in the nineteenth century, 'but from the "fathers"'.⁸¹ My focus has therefore been less on whether Warner deliberately chose 'defective' with its Social Darwinist associations in mind, than on the wider context of its availability as a powerfully generic metaphor that conjoins editorial theory's moralism and positivism with contemporary discussions around disability, class, and race. Social Darwinism was not a theoretical storehouse from which textual critics simply borrowed operative discourses and metaphors. Rather, philology and pseudoscience were closely linked in and by a broader ideological and political project that imagined English cultural and racial superiority in terms of a temporal gulf between races, and in which Britain's imperial project was buttressed by textual critics' codification of a coherent, prestigious national literature firmly rooted in the medieval past. There could be only a limited role in this project for the 'defective'.

IV What's in a name?

The 'Defective' designation and the editorial attitudes it encapsulates have had significant consequences for scholarship on Mandeville's *Book*. The Cotton and Egerton versions have long been utilised as 'best text' editions, their perceived completeness in comparison to the large group of 'defective' manuscripts held to outweigh the fact that they may never have

circulated beyond the locations in which they produced. Though few and far between, there have been dissenting voices. Ralph Hanna wrote in 1984 of how a ‘prevalent scholarly confusion about what a Mandeville text should be has denied the common version that central status it should hold in ME studies’.⁸² Similarly, in her extensive 1988 study of Mandeville’s *Book* and its sources, Christiane Deluz refers to ‘Defective’ as ‘la version dite *common* ou *Pynson*’.⁸³ Nevertheless, ‘Defective’ remains by far its most common designation and it was not until Tamarah Kohanski’s 2001 edition of Pynson’s 1496 print that a critical edition became widely available. M. C. Seymour’s Early English Text Society edition was published in 2002 and Kohanski and C. David Benson’s edition of the idiosyncratic ‘Defective’ text preserved in London, British Library, MS Royal 17 C. xxxviii text in 2007. It remains the case, though, that scholars are yet to fully appreciate that the ‘Defective’ version can be defined not only by the ‘Egypt gap’—which contrary to Warner’s claim, some later scribes did perceive and attempt to ameliorate—but also by a remarkable amount of further textual variance across the extant manuscripts.

To be blunt: renaming the ‘Defective’ version of Mandeville’s *Book* the ‘Common’ version would, I think, be a good move. ‘Common’ has its own depreciatory undertones, of course, in its meaning not only of ordinariness, but also of inferior quality and low status.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, ‘Common’ usefully intimates the relative manuscript circulation of the different English versions of Mandeville’s *Book*; that is, ‘Common’ might help to further redress the fact that one of the most widely-circulating versions of the text until the nineteenth century was rendered all but invisible to critics and general readers for much of the twentieth, an episode that continues to exert considerable influence over scholarship on Mandeville’s *Book*.

That being said, renaming the ‘Defective’ version could also serve to overwrite a broader and more challenging issue. As Kohanski emphasises in the introduction to her 2001

edition, while all share the ‘Egypt gap’, the textual variance across the manuscripts of the ‘Common’ version ranges broadly from the incidental to the substantive, in a manner that calls into question its coherence as a single ‘Version’ at all.⁸⁵ Rather than one ‘Common’ version, the extant manuscripts might be better thought of as a more fluid collection of texts that, while they share a distant antecedent, in many cases reveal more significant differences than they do similarities. As well as renaming this version, then, Mandeville scholars might also consider whether its textual multiplicity warrants a more thorough-going appraisal of the editorial and critical principals that have been used to group these manuscripts on the basis of a handful of shared absences and errors. The response to Kohanski’s engaging proposition, or rather the lack thereof, provides a useful example of how difficult it is to remake or revise long-lived editorial categories and metaphors, though. In his review of her edition, Iain M. Higgins engages thoughtfully, if briefly, with Kohanski’s thesis.⁸⁶ However, beyond that it has, as far as I am aware, received little direct attention from scholars of Mandeville’s *Book*.

The story of ‘Defective’ Mandeville—the name’s endurance, as well as its origins—and the task of alighting on an alternative designation also direct us toward broader considerations of the limits of traditional modes of philology, codicology, and textual criticism. In the preceding discussion, I sought to show how recent work in disability studies provides one way of revaluating what has become an overly familiar textual metaphor. This approach prompts an important, though difficult question: what would an editorial theory and practice rigorously informed by the tenants of disability theory, and by a politics of inclusion and pluralism more broadly, look like? A handful of recent interventions have broached similar questions. In an essay on John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis* (1390), for instance, Malte Urban outlines how our understanding of the poem’s complex textual history across more than fifty manuscript copies could be enriched through a practice of ‘queer editing’.⁸⁷ The poem, Urban argues, would be best-served by an avowedly ‘non-normative’ critical approach

and an electronic critical edition that ‘emphasises variants and heterogeneity over a desire to produce a relatively stable text’.⁸⁸ While not explicitly framed through reference to contemporary disability theory or in terms of a queer politics, Michael Sargent’s account of ‘rhizomorphic’ editing follows a similar path. Sargent calls for a self-consciously ‘post-modern’ edition that ‘does not attempt to trace all forms of the text back genetically to an idealized Urtext but would seek rather to demonstrate the relations of the surviving manuscripts to each other in a textual network’.⁸⁹

Both Urban and Sargent argue that digital technologies offer the means by which to fully realize their visions of ‘non-normative’ editing. For Urban, ‘the decentered digital sphere with its various tools and conflicted relation to normative systems’ offers the best environment in which to encounter a poem that itself revels in ‘a multitude of possible meanings’ and ‘contains an intricate network of heterogeneous voices’ that disrupt its ‘temporal frame’ and refuse ‘straightforward linear progression’.⁹⁰ Sargent’s working model of a digital ‘textual cloud’ of manuscript transcriptions, images, and further information provides a comparable account of how a ‘rhizomorphic’ editorial method could be realised. Further, Sargent argues that rather than ‘a hierarchical editorial team organized by a single scholar supported by ranks of junior faculty and graduate research assistants,’ the production of an online edition of this kind could be carried out by ‘an ongoing cooperative team’ of scholars who work on the project and accredit future editorial members.⁹¹

These are appealing visions in many ways, and I certainly share Urban’s and Sargent’s enthusiasm for thinking anew about textual relations. However, they also present a number of theoretical and logistical challenges. What Urban calls ‘the digital sphere’ is not inherently decentralising or liberatory—digital archives, databases, and tools are never ideologically neutral, and both hardware and software are entangled in broader social, economic, legal, and disciplinary regulatory structures.⁹² Cloud computing offers a

particularly compelling vision of digital openness, as Sargent's account attests. However, the cloud's ostensible limitlessness and easy accessibility are carefully managed fictions, rather than inviolable realities, of the digital platforms and infrastructures owned by increasingly powerful corporations like Google and Apple.⁹³

Further, the funding requirements of even the kind of edition 'exercised within some kind of 'Wiki' format' advocated by Sargent would be significant. The first wave of large-scale digital editing projects during the 1990s and early 2000s showed how rapidly optimistic visions of digital abundance and openness can unravel amid the wider withdrawal of education funding, increasing inter-institutional competition as a result of higher education marketisation, and ambiguous plans for electronic sustainability.⁹⁴ With the ongoing defunding of the humanities in Europe and North America and the accompanying large-scale casualization of academic labour, these challenges have in many ways only sharpened since digital technologies first offered textual scholars the chance to experiment with new editorial methods and text visualizations. Sargent's brief account of 'an ongoing cooperative team' broaches this issue to an extent, but amid the broader uncertainty and insecurity of employment in the humanities, the question of exactly how 'ongoing' such a project and team could really be—and whose interests they would ultimately serve—remains an open one.

Significantly, scholarship on Mandeville's *Book* already has a well-developed tradition of describing the text in the editorial terms advocated by Sargent: Higgins's oft-cited characterisation of the *Book* as a 'multitext' and 'multinodal network, a kind of rhizome, so to speak,' is now over two decades old, and has served to decisively undermine the applicability of stemmatics for an understanding of how the *Book* spread across Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.⁹⁵ However, this description of the *Book* has not, so far, been accompanied by a large-scale editorial project of the kind that once seemed the likely future direction of the field. The *Book*'s complex textual history—medieval and modern—

intimates how the task of linking ‘intervention at the level of rhetoric itself’, the primary purpose of this article, with the composition of new non-normative, multilingual, and accessible editorial methods is one that can only be achieved collaboratively.⁹⁶ However, the latter task looks increasingly difficult to realize sustainably and ethically amid the deepening systematic exploitation of early career academics in particular and what Miriam Posner describes as the ‘boom-and-bust cycle of grant-chasing and temporary funding’.⁹⁷ The conditions of academic labour are inseparable from questions of editorial theory and practice, a fact too rarely acknowledged, even in theoretically progressive visions like Urban’s.

The broader ideological and political context in which the field of Medieval Studies exists, and in which it is complicit, provides the underlying framework for my discussion of how and when ‘Defective’ Mandeville came to be called ‘defective’. This story is just one example, albeit a significant one, of how what can come to appear as neutral descriptors are underlain by complex and often troubling histories. The Medievalists of Color collective recently wrote of how ‘We aim our attention toward the survival and future of the study of the Middle Ages, which we must continuously work to separate from its links to nationalist and white supremacist impulses’.⁹⁸ One type of scholarly work required, among many others, is a comprehensive return to the metaphors the field lives by, and the composition of alternative editorial methods and discourses that are open—both theoretically and practically—to critical reflection and revision.

¹ For a useful appraisal of Lachmann’s methods, see Markus Stock, ‘Introduction: Philological Moves’, *Florilegium*, 32 (2015), 1-17.

² For a broad-ranging account of Bédier's life, as well as his textual theory and practice, see Michelle R. Warren, *Creole Medievalism: Colonial France and Joseph Bédier's Middle Ages* (Minneapolis, 2011).

³ See D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London, 1986) and Jerome J. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Chicago, 1983).

⁴ Paul Zumthor, *La lettre et la voix: De la "littérature" médiévale* (Paris, 1987); Bernard Cerquiglini, *Éloge de la variance: Histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris, 1989).

⁵ See, for example, Arthur Bahr, *Fragments and Assemblages: Forming Compilations of Medieval London* (Chicago, 2013); Alexandra Gillespie, 'Manuscript', in Marion Turner (ed.), *A Handbook of Middle English Studies* (Chichester, 2013), 171-85; Roberta Magnani and Diane Watt, 'Towards a queer philology', *postmedieval*, 9.3 (2018), 252–68.

⁶ Magnani and Watt, 'Towards a queer philology', 255-6.

⁷ Robert Meyer-Lee, 'Abandon the Fragments', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 35 (2013), 47-83.

⁸ Julie Orlemanski, 'Philology and the Turn Away from the Linguistic Turn', *Florilegium*, 32 (2015), 157-81, 177.

⁹ Michelle R. Warren, 'The Politics of Textual Scholarship', in Neil Fraistat and Julia Flanders (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship* (Cambridge, 2013), 120.

¹⁰ Andrew B. R. Elliott, 'A Vile Love Affair: Right Wing Nationalism and the Middle Ages', *The Public Medievalist* (pubd online 14 Feb 2017) <<https://www.publicmedievalist.com/vile-love-affair/>> accessed 16 Feb 2017.

¹¹ Dorothy Kim, 'Teaching Medieval Studies in a Time of White Supremacy', *In the Middle* (pubd online 28 August 2017) <<http://www.inthemedievalmiddle.com/2017/08/teaching-medieval-studies-in-time-of.html>> accessed 30 August 2017. See also, The Medievalists of Color Collective, 'On Race and Medieval Studies', *Medievalists of Color* (pubd online 1

August 2017) <<http://medievalistsofcolor.com/statements/on-race-and-medieval-studies/>>

accessed 3 August 2017; Jonathan Hsy, 'Antiracist Medievalisms: Lessons from Chinese Exclusion', *In the Middle* (pubd 16 February 2018)

<<http://www.inthemedievalmiddle.com/2018/02/antiracist-medievalisms-lessons-from.html>>

accessed 17 February 2018; and Sierra Lomuto, 'Public Medievalism and the Rigor of Anti-Racist Critique', *In the Middle* (pubd online 4 April 2019)

<<http://www.inthemedievalmiddle.com/2019/04/public-medievalism-and-rigor-of-anti.html>>

accessed 6 April 2019. On medieval race-making and race-thinking, and its relationship to modern racism, see Cord Whitaker, 'Editor's Introduction: Race-ing the dragon: the Middle Ages, race and trippin' into the future *postmedieval*, 6.1 (2015), 3-11.

¹² Anthony Bale, "'ut legi": Sir John Mandeville's Audience and Three Late Medieval English Travelers to Italy and Jerusalem', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 38 (2016), 201-37, 210.

¹³ See in particular Iain M. Higgins's influential *Writing East: The "Travels" of Sir John Mandeville* (Philadelphia, 1997).

¹⁴ On Mandeville and postcolonial theory, see Lisa Lampert-Weissig, *Medieval Literature and Postcolonial Studies* (Edinburgh, 2010), 86-107; and Shirin A. Khanmohamadi, *In Light of Another's Word: European Ethnography in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2014), 113-144. On 'early globalities' as an alternative to the Eurocentric 'Middle Ages', see Geraldine Heng and Lynn Ramey, 'Early Globalities, Global Literatures: Introducing a Special Issue on the Global Middle Ages', *Literature Compass*, 11.7 (2014), 1-6.

¹⁵ Unless otherwise noted, citations from Mandeville's *Book* are from Tamarah Kohanski and C. David Benson's edition of the 'Defective' version and are given parenthetically by line number (*The Book of John Mandeville* (Kalamazoo, 2007)). Like Carolyn Dinshaw, I use 'Mandeville' throughout, rather than the more awkward 'Mandeville-author', without the

assumption a person called Sir John Mandeville ‘actually authored the text’ (*How Soon is Now? Medieval Texts, Amateur Readers, and the Queerness of Time* (Durham, N. C., 2012), 195). On Mandeville’s purported Englishness, see Suzanne Conklin Akbari, *Idols in the East: European Representations of Islam and the Orient, 1100-1450* (Ithaca, 2009), 53, 64-65.

¹⁶ *Jean de Mandeville: Le livre des merveilles du monde*, ed. Christiane Deluz (Paris, 2000), 21.

¹⁷ *The Book of John Mandeville, with Related Texts*, ed. Iain M. Higgins (Indianapolis, 2011), xii.

¹⁸ Geraldine Heng, *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2018), 10. Mandeville has drawn praise from many modern critics not only for his engaging narrative voice, but also for his judicious attitude to the so-called ‘monstrous races’ he encounters. Mandeville also carefully describes many of the varied religious practices he observes during his travels. ‘Men sholde have no man in dispite for hire diverse lyvenge Mandeville asserts late in his *Book*, ‘for we wyteth [know] noght wham [who] God loveth most, and wham he hateth most’ (2636-37). However, Mandeville’s ‘tolerant’ attitude has one important exception—undergirding the *Book* is a virulent anti-Jewishness that culminates in the eschatological vision of the ten lost tribes of the Jews enclosed by the mountains of ‘Caspyze’ (2352-82). As Sierra Lomuto argues, the *Book* demands critical approaches that ‘acknowledge the tolerance we do see...as part of a more nuanced system of racial hierarchy’ (‘White Nationalism and the Ethics of Medieval Studies’, *In the Middle* (pubd 5 December 2016) <<http://www.inthemedievalmiddle.com/2016/12/white-nationalism-and-ethics-of.html>> accessed 7 December 2016).

¹⁹ Michelle R. Warren, ‘Post-Philology’, in Patricia Clare Ingham and Michelle R. Warren (eds.), *Postcolonial Moves: Medieval Through Modern* (New York, 2003), 33. On textual and

editorial metaphors, philology, and colonialism, see also Warren's 'Philology in Ruins', *Florilegium*, 32 (2015), 59-76.

²⁰ Dinshaw, *How Soon*, 26.

²¹ On the question of 'which French?', see Higgins (ed.), xv-xvi.

²² Higgins argues that 'there is no necessarily "authoritative" text' of the late medieval and early modern 'cultural phenomenon and a multi-textual commonplace' that is Mandeville's *Book* (*Writing East*, 17). Textual idealism has long been frustrated by this textual plurality: scholarship on the *Book* since the late nineteenth century is punctuated by claims of definitive critical editions, complete stemma, and large-scale studies that are soon to appear, only to be quietly dropped, a discontinuous scholarly history that ironically mirrors the *Book*'s discontinuous textual history.

²³ Iain M. Higgins, 'Mandeville', in A. S. G. Edwards (ed.), *A Companion to Middle English Prose* (Cambridge, 2004), 104-5.

²⁴ *Sir John Mandeville: The Book of Marvels and Travels*, ed. Anthony Bale (Oxford, 2012), xxxi.

²⁵ *The Book of John Mandeville: An Edition of the Pynson Text*, ed. Tamarah Kohanski (Tempe, AZ, 2001), x.

²⁶ See Higgins, 'Mandeville', 105-10.

²⁷ *Mandeville's Travels, Translated from the French of Jean d'Outremeuse. Edited from Ms. Cotton Titus c. XVI, in the British Museum*, ed. Paul Hamelius, Early English Text Soc. os. 153-54 (London, 1919-23), 4.

²⁸ Higgins, *Writing East*, 19.

²⁹ Dinshaw, *How Soon*, 90. For a concise summary of the main contributions to the debate regarding the *Book*'s authorship, see Bale (ed.), x-xvi.

³⁰ *The Buke of John Maundeuell, Being the Travels of Sir John Mandeville, Knt., 1332-1356*, ed. George F. Warner (London, 1889), xxix.

³¹ Warner ed., xiv-xv. On the connections between Yule's long career in Bengal and Burma and his philological studies, particularly his strong 'disidentification' with Mandeville, see Dinshaw, *How Soon*, 90-5.

³² E. B. Nicholson and Henry Yule, 'Mandeville, Jehan de', *Encyclopedia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature*, ninth ed., (New York, 1883), 475.

³³ Warner (ed.), x-xi.

³⁴ Warner (ed.), x.

³⁵ Geraldine Heng, *Empire of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy* (New York, 2003), 423. The text of the Egerton version has been slightly rearranged from the French text and material both added and omitted. Higgins characterises its 'maker' as not only 'an alert reader, but also pious, intelligent, well read, and something of an English nationalist' (*The Book of John Mandeville*, 200).

³⁶ 'History', *The Roxburghe Club* (pubd online 15 May 2002)

<<https://www.roxburghclub.org.uk/history/>> accessed 10 January 2017.

³⁷ On the early history of the Club and its founding members, see Shayne Husband, *The Early Roxburghe Club 1812-1835: Book Club Pioneers and the Advancement of English Literature* (London, 2018).

³⁸ William Benzie, *Dr. F. J. Furnivall: Victorian Scholar Adventurer* (Norman, OK., 1983), 118.

³⁹ David Matthews describes the EETS's books as aimed 'at an educated middle class, as opposed to the tightly controlled Roxburghe Club, which reserved its texts for an aristocratic and gentlemanly few' (*The Making of Middle English, 1765-1910* (Minneapolis, 1999), xiv).

⁴⁰ Mike Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts: El Niño Famines and the Making of the Third World* (London, 2001), 35.

⁴¹ Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts*, 29-65. In his copy of Warner's edition, Salisbury could have read Mandeville's description of 'þe land of Inde' as 'þe maste plentifous land of folk þat es overwhare [anywhere], by cause of þe grete commoditez þat it has þerin...þare es grete plentee and grete cheep of all manner of vitaile [food]' (Warner (ed.), 101).

⁴² Bernard Regan, *The Balfour Declaration: Empire, the Mandate and Resistance in Palestine* (London, 2018), 1.

⁴³ Davis, *Late Victorian Holocausts*, 9. This is a necessarily brief account of the New Imperialism of the late nineteenth century. For a more detailed account, which also engages in detail with Davis's work, see Richard Drayton, 'Imperial History and the Human Future', *History Workshop Journal*, 74.1 (2012), 156-72.

⁴⁴ Regan, *The Balfour Declaration*, 201.

⁴⁵ Dinshaw, *How Soon*, 26.

⁴⁶ Warner (ed.), vii.

⁴⁷ *The Libelle of Englyshe Polycye*, ed. George F. Warner (Oxford, 1926), xvii.

⁴⁸ See Kohanski and Benson (eds.), Appendix: Sources for *The Book of John Mandeville*.

⁴⁹ Warner (ed.), 200.

⁵⁰ On the history of the PEF, see John James Moscrop, *Measuring Jerusalem: The Palestine Exploration Fund and British Interests in the Holy Land* (London, 2000).

⁵¹ Warner (ed.), 38.

⁵² Warner (ed.), 178; Claude Reignier Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine: A Record of Discovery and Adventure* (London, 1878), 174-81.

⁵³ Warner (ed.), 201.

⁵⁴ Warner (ed.), 98, 203.

⁵⁵ Dinshaw, *How Soon*, 76.

⁵⁶ Andrew Lang, *Letters to Dead Authors* (London, 1886), 110-18; M. R. James, *Athens in the Fourteenth Century: An Inedited Supplement to Sir John Mandeville's Travels* (Cambridge, 1887).

⁵⁷ Dinshaw, *How Soon*, 26.

⁵⁸ *Oxford English Dictionary*, 'defective' adj. and n., 3,
<<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/48766>> accessed 10 June 2017.

⁵⁹ See Daniel Wakelin, *Scribal Correction and Literary Craft: English Manuscripts 1375—1510* (Oxford, 2014), 258-61.

⁶⁰ Karla Mallette, *European Modernity and the Arab Mediterranean: Toward a New Philology and a Counter-Orientalism* (Philadelphia, 2010), 9-10.

⁶¹ Joseph Grigely, *Textualterity: Art, Theory and Textual Criticism* (Ann Arbor, 1995), 11.

⁶² Grigely, *Textualterity*, 20.

⁶³ Grigely, *Textualterity*, 21.

⁶⁴ Warner (ed.), xi.

⁶⁵ *Middle English Dictionary*, s.v. 'defectif' adj., 2a, 3a,
<<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED10801/>> accessed 10 June 2017.

⁶⁶ Douglas C. Baynton, *Defectives in the Land: Disability and Immigration in the Age of Eugenics* (Chicago, 2016), 8.

⁶⁷ Baynton, *Defectives in the Land*, 1.

⁶⁸ Baynton, *Defectives in the Land*, 8

⁶⁹ Baynton, *Defectives in the Land*, 6-7, 48-78.

⁷⁰ Zrinka Stahuljak, *Pornographic Archaeology: Medicine, Medievalism, and the Invention of the French Nation* (Philadelphia, 2012), 10. Stahuljak traces the role of both 'historical

knowledge’ and ‘fictions and fantasies’ of the Middle Ages in the ‘double transference of ideas between French medievalists (roughly divided between historians, writers, and philologists) and their professional counterparts practicing medicine’ around theories of heredity during the last quarter of the nineteenth century (3).

⁷¹ Baynton, *Defectives in the Land*, 8.

⁷² Baynton, *Defectives in the Land*, 2.

⁷³ Amy Kaufmann, ‘Purity’ in Elizabeth Emery and Richard Utz (eds.), *Medievalism: Key Critical Terms* (Cambridge, 2014), 200.

⁷⁴ Baynton, *Defectives in the Land*, 8. On the ‘politics of plasticity, rather than determinism, in nineteenth-century culture’, see also Kyla Schuller, *The Biopolitics of Feeling: Race, Sex and Science in the Nineteenth Century* (Durham, N. C., 2018), 5.

⁷⁵ Baynton, *Defectives in the Land*, 12; Angela Saini, *Superior: The Return of Race Science* (London, 2019), 68-71.

⁷⁶ Richard Gott, *Britain’s Empire: Resistance, Repression and Revolt* (London, 2011), 473; see also Priyamvada Gopal, *Insurgent Empire: Anticolonial Resistance and British Dissent* (London, 2019).

⁷⁷ Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (London, 1995), 53.

⁷⁸ McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 43.

⁷⁹ Grigely, *Textualterity*, 11, 20.

⁸⁰ Warner (ed.), vii.

⁸¹ Kathleen Biddick, *The Shock of Medievalism* (Durham, N. C., 1998), 3.

⁸² Ralph Hanna, ‘Mandeville’ in A. S. G. Edwards (ed.), *Middle English Prose: A Critical Guide* (New Brunswick, 1984), 123.

⁸³ Christiane Deluz, *Le Livre de Jehan de Mandeville: Une 'Géographie' au XIV^e siècle* (Louvain, 1988), 338.

⁸⁴ *Oxford English Dictionary*, 'common' adj., 11a, 14,
<<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/37216/>> accessed 20 November 2018.

⁸⁵ Kohanski (ed.), xxv.

⁸⁶ Iain M. Higgins, review of Tamarah Kohanski (ed.), *The Book of John Mandeville An Edition of the Pynson Text* (Tempe, 2001), in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 103.2 (2004), 267-9, 269.

⁸⁷ Malte Urban, 'Gower out of time and place', *postmedieval*, 9.3 (2018), 303–17. For a useful sample of recent alternative theoretical approaches to textual criticism, see Warren, 'Politics', 127, 130-1.

⁸⁸ Urban, 'Gower out of time and place', 315.

⁸⁹ Michael G. Sargent, 'Editing Walter Hilton's *Scale of Perfection*: The Case for a Rhizomorphic Historical Edition', in Vincent Gillespie and Anne Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 509.

⁹⁰ Urban, 'Gower out of time and place', 315.

⁹¹ Michael G. Sargent, 'Organic and Cybernetic Metaphors for Manuscript Relations: Stemma—Cladogram—Rhizome—Cloud', in Ian Johnson and Allan F. Westphall (eds.), *The Pseudo-Bonaventuran Lives of Christ: Exploring the Middle English Tradition* (Turnhout, 2013), 254.

⁹² For a number of incisive critiques of and future visions for the digital humanities, see the essays collected in Dorothy Kim and Jesse Stommel (eds.), *Disrupting the Digital Humanities* (New York, 2018).

⁹³ On ownership of the cloud, see Tung-Hui Hu, *The Prehistory of the Cloud* (London, 2015), 145-8.

⁹⁴ See Bella Millet, 'Whatever Happened to Electronic Editing', in Vincent Gillespie and Anne Hudson (eds.) *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 39–54.

⁹⁵ Higgins, *Writing East*, 18.

⁹⁶ Warren, 'Politics', 131.

⁹⁷ Miriam Posner, 'Money and Time', *Miriam Posner's Blog* (pubd online 14 March 2016) <<http://miriamposner.com/blog/money-and-time/>> accessed 10 Feb 2019. See also Kathi Inman Berens, 'DH Adjuncts: Social Justice and Care', in Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein (eds.) *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2019* (pubd online 2019) <<https://doi.org/10.5749/9781452963785>> accessed 10 July 2019.

⁹⁸ Medievalists of Color, 'On Race'. I finished revising this essay shortly after Medievalists of Color co-founder Mary Rambaran-Olm publicly resigned her position on the executive board of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists, during a lecture at the second meeting of the Race Before Race symposium, in protest at a number of linked issues including the Society's stonewalling of discussions around its name and its mistreatment and exclusion of early career scholars. On the broader context of Rambaran-Olm's decision, see 'Academia from the Margins: Mary Rambaran-Olm and Adam Miyashiro Discuss White Supremacy, Racism, and the Academy', *Remixing the Humanities* (pubd online 8 October 2019) <https://www.spreaker.com/user/sol-mates/white-supremacy-in-medieval-studies?fbclid=IwAR1VtiKuSVOPmW0MPRL19O_bmW7SMSl_hb20GGY-sDQMtqNzK8po6WLl6Zw> accessed 9 October 2019. Further, Erik Wade has documented and challenged the investment of white supremacist groups in academic discussions like that

surrounding the designation ‘Anglo-Saxon’. See, for example,

<https://twitter.com/erik_kaars/status/1189149930419642368> accessed 29 October 2019.