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PART II

Modern Discourses on Spain
From Hispanophobia to Quixotephilia: The Politics of Quixotism in the British Long Eighteenth Century

Pedro Javier Pardo

Abstract
This chapter explores the reception of Don Quixote in the British long eighteenth century in the context of the tension between traditional political Hispanophobia and emerging literary Quixotephilia. It first speculates on how the former may have influenced the negative conception of Don Quixote dominating the seventeenth century, epitomized by Edmund Gayton’s Hispanophobic Quixote. It then focuses on political appropriations by Sir William Temple and Lord Carteret and how they negotiated this tension in the eighteenth century: through reinterpretation and canonization they turned Don Quixote into a classic, but, in so doing, they separated it from its national background and turned the text and even Cervantes against Spain. Finally, the chapter briefly considers a later, Romantic means of resolving the tension, Lord Byron’s Hispanophilic Quixote.
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Introduction

1. Edmund Gayton and the Hispanophobic Quixote

It has often been noted that the publication of Edmund Gayton’s Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixote in 1654 signals the nadir of the most negative

1 This article is part of the research project ‘El Quijote de Cervantes: impacto cultural y editorial de la narrativa española en la Inglaterra moderna (1605-1750)’, funded by the Junta de Andalucía.
interpretation of *Don Quixote* in England. Gayton’s book-length commentary on Cervantes’s work, the first ever published in any language, transforms the hero into a ‘sly coward’, ‘an unabashed liar’, ‘a vagabond’, ‘a hypocritical thief’, a ‘sly fox’, or a ‘meanly-mouthed courtier’, to use the words quoted from the text by one of the best-known experts on the English reception of *Don Quixote*, Edwin Knowles. What is not usually remarked is that this commentary was published when England was a republic ruled by Oliver Cromwell, after the Civil War in which the Puritans, or Roundheads, defeated the Royalists, or Cavaliers. According to the *Oxford Companion to British History*, cavalier stems ‘from the Spanish word *caballero* (Latin *caballarius*, French *chevalier*) and ‘it was meant to connote Catholicism, foreignness, and immorality’, since it originated as a term of abuse coined by the Puritans for the Royalists: ‘Parliamentary propagandists accordingly disseminated an image of the typical cavalier as a rakish individual consumed by the pursuit of illicit pleasure and personal gain, a man devoid of moral principles.’ It is noteworthy that the image summoned by the term and prevailing at the time of the Puritan Interregnum coincides with Gayton’s negative description of the Spanish Don. We could say that, in a certain way, in his extremely negative presentation of the Manchegan knight-errant, Gayton is turning the *caballero* into a *cavalier*, which is reinforced by the satire against knight-errantry running throughout the book and based on the double meaning of *errant* as wandering and erring, as Colahan has pointed, a term also applicable to the *erring* because defeated and *wandering* because banished Cavaliers. The resulting image of the Cavaliers as Quixotic *errant* knights is never openly stated and hence the connection cannot be proved. As a matter of fact, Gayton’s royalist allegiance in the Civil War makes it improbable, to say the least, that he meant to write a

---

2 Knowles, ‘Cervantes and English Literature’, pp. 270-271. He draws attention to the disappearance of any trace of idealism or seriousness in Gayton’s farcical and distorted version of the book, as Wilson does to the process of animalization undergone by the original character: ‘A pig, a snake, a goose, an ass, [...] a hare, and a toad: these are the animals Don Quixote conjured up for Gayton. The Knight’s appearance and character are consistently demeaned and debased. [...] Gayton’s *Quixote* is a caricature’ (Wilson, ‘Cervantes’, pp. 32-33). See also Wilson, ‘Edmund Gayton on Don Quixote’.

3 Gentles, ‘Cavaliers’.

4 Colahan, ‘Knight-Errantry’, pp. 160-161. The possibility of considering the Cavaliers an anachronistic expression of outmoded chivalry, and in this sense as Quixotic, is also suggested by Colahan when he writes that ‘by the middle of the seventeenth century Britain had come to see its own moribund chivalric roots, perceived as still alive in Spain when Cervantes had satirized them, as typical of an outdated and even alien culture’ (p. 169).
satire on the Cavaliers, but the connection could have been in the mind of contemporary readers, particularly Puritan ones.\(^5\)

This is just one example of how juxtaposing the political and the literary, even in this speculative way, opens up appealing prospects and suggests tantalizing convergences. Gayton’s political significance for us, however, does not lie in how his commentary on *Don Quixote* could have been fuelled by hatred or phobia against the Cavaliers, which is very dubious, but against Spain. It is true that Gayton’s view of the Don is anchored in the farcical and burlesque interpretation of Cervantes’s book dominant in the seventeenth century, but he takes it to such an extreme of degradation and debasement that it can also be contemplated as one more symptom of the Hispanophobia still reigning in England in the mid-seventeenth century.\(^6\) The Treaty of London (1604) and the ensuing peace, a landmark in the new Hispanophilic policy of James I, which was supposed to culminate in the marriage of Prince Charles and the Infanta, had certainly done something to abate this feeling, which the memory of the not-so-far-removed Spanish Armada (1588) kept very much alive. But then the Gunpowder Plot and its Catholic roots (1605), the ‘explosion of anti-Hispanic propaganda’ and theatre caused by the Spanish Match – comparable only to that of the Elizabethan era in the wake of the Armada\(^7\) – together with its eventual abortion (1623), and the war with Spain in the United Provinces of the Netherlands (1625-1630) put things

\(^5\) As the entry of the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* on Gayton explains, he was a proud and staunch royalist, who served as a captain in the Duke of York’s company during the royalist occupation of Oxford, where he was a fellow of St John’s College and had been appointed superior beadle in arts and physic to the university (McLellan, ‘Gayton, Edmund’). Smith emphasizes this ideological dimension in his discussion of the *Pleasant Notes*, detecting anti-Puritan sentiment in certain passages and thus justifying his thesis that the work belongs in a group of Spanish narratives which are politically subversive through rebellious humour and marginal characters. Gayton’s work is thus related to Thomas Shelton’s (a Roman Catholic Irishman) and James Mabbe’s (thought to be a Roman Catholic spy) well-known translations of Spanish masterpieces, namely, *Don Quixote*, *Guzmán*, and *Celestina*: ‘When Gayton came to write his *Pleasant Notes* he wrote in this tradition. What was once Spanish translated into English in the service of Roman Catholic agendas becomes commentary as a means of keeping alive a defeated royalist cultural heritage. Dissidence by errantry was the name of the game’ (Smith, ‘Windmills over Oxford’, p. 114).

\(^6\) For an overview of the reception of *Don Quixote* in English literature, and particularly in the seventeenth century, see, in addition to the articles by Knowles and Wilson already cited, Randall and Boswell, *Cervantes*, and Pardo, ‘Reino Unido’. The classic study of Hispanophobia in England is *The Black Legend in England*, by William Maltby, but a more modern approach with extremely useful bibliographical updating can be found in Rodríguez Pérez et al., *España ante sus críticas*.

\(^7\) Griffin, ‘Dramatizing the Black Legend’, p. 220.
on the old track. Spain was still the domineering colonial power to reckon with for any aspiring contender and, more importantly, was associated with the absolutism of the Stuarts leading to the Civil War and with the Catholicism constantly denigrated in propagandist pamphlets ever since Tudor times. This religious antagonism could only be stronger under the Puritan regime, a foregone conclusion if one reads the anti-Spanish tracts by the Puritan Thomas Scott in the 1620s. In this context, it is difficult not to see Hispanophobic overtones in Gayton’s brutal disfigurement of Don Quixote: the prevailing negative interpretation of the character is not just in tune with, but undoubtedly intensified by, the negative perception of Spain and the Spaniards.

This seems to be confirmed by the reappearance of this disfigured version of the Spanish hero in the major English Quixotic figure of the seventeenth century, the protagonist of Samuel Butler’s narrative poem *Hudibras* (1663, 1664, 1678), whose Cervantine affiliation has long been recognized and studied by scholars. As a matter of fact, Hudibras is closer to Gayton’s Quixote in his hypocrisy, cowardice, and dubious behaviour than to Cervantes’s insane but noble Don. This denial of the quintessence of quixotism, which we can call *anti-quixotism*, recurs in other contemporary texts that exploit the Quixotic trope in figures who are debased and distorted beyond quixotism in order to demolish the ideologies they embody. Before *Hudibras*, a pamphlet entitled *Don Pedro de Quixot* (1660) and targeting Hugh Peters, a Puritan cleric and preacher who had been executed that very same year of the Restoration, represented him not just as Quixotic but also as lacking any conscience and honesty. And, after *Hudibras*, the same kind of anti-quixotism is now turned against the Royalists in the anonymous *Don Quixot Redivivus Encountering a Barns-Door* (c. 1673), a short account of an attack against peaceful Puritans in Andover on 7 September 1673 under the leadership of a captain of the Anglican militia who is represented as a Quixote, although in a very sketchy and rudimentary way. Cervantes’s hero is thus drawn into the political arena and engaged on both sides of the religious strife, as Randall and Boswell have aptly documented in their review of the term ‘ecclesiastical quixotism’. From the earliest stages of his reception in Britain, Don Quixote is intensely immersed in politics and ideological conflict.

What matters for our purpose, however, is not that in the seventeenth century both Puritans and Royalists – and, later on, Tories and Whigs,
Jacobins and Loyalists – were represented as Quixotic by their adversaries, that is, political quixotism, but that this latter implied an extremely negative or distorted version of the Don, who was soaked in fanaticism, hypocrisy, or pernicious ideologies, and deprived of any redeeming qualities. Gayton proves that this view is not just a question of the ideology attributed to the Quixotic figure, since he did not write a satire against the Cavaliers, but a commentary on Don Quixote. The anti-quixotic virulence of that commentary can perhaps better be explained by anti-Spanish prejudice than by political satire. My hypothesis is that Hispanophobia may justify the extremely negative representation as well as the welcoming reception of the most famous Spanish character on English soil, since he is seen as an ideal playground to project the hostility that defined Anglo-Spanish relations at that time.  

The negative views of both Spain and Don Quixote thus coalesce in the initial stages of that reception and produce an interpretation of the Quixotic figure that I will call the Hispanophobic Quixote. This does not spring from political quixotism, but from the politics of quixotism (or quixotics), which can be subsumed under the larger category of the politics of reception.

By this I mean the part politics play in how foreign literature is received in any national literature because of how they condition – or at least participate in fashioning – the horizon of expectations of both authors and readers. The Hispanophobic Quixote is an exemplary case of those politics, and this gives a new turn to the paradox underlying Spanish influence on early modern England, which Barbara Fuchs has so aptly thrown into relief: ‘Early modern English writers turned frequently to Spain for literary models, even at times of greatest rivalry between the two nations.’ 12 Fuchs draws attention to how this tension between cultural fascination and political enmity was resolved through ‘occlusion’ of influence or debt, which she detects even in later literary historians and details in the operations of ‘domestication, disavowal, or occlusion of Spanish sources, efforts to overgo or trump the original, and freeze-framing of Spain into stereotype or allegory’. 13

11 This hypothesis could be supported by a cursory comparison with the less negative Quixotic figures abounding in seventeenth-century French narrative, which, unfortunately, we don’t have the time or space to undertake here. I mean the protagonists of novels such as Charles Sorel’s L’Anti-Roman, ou le Berger extravagant (1627), Paul Scarron’s Le Roman comique (1651–57), or Antoine Furetière’s Le Roman bourgeois (1666). Even if partaking in the prevailing seventeenth-century comic view of Don Quixote as a fool to be derided, the heroes of these works lack the extreme debasement and anti-quixotism of their English counterparts.


13 Ibid., p. 6. As Fuchs explains, ‘the English turn to Spain appears paradoxical, given the religious and political enmity between the two nations […], and more important, the early modern English rivalry with Spain has largely coloured our own cultural and intellectual histories,
degradation or even denigration of Don Quixote to the point of disfigurement can be seen as one more of those efforts, and the eighteenth century will add other possibilities when the increasing appreciation of Cervantes redeems first the book and then the character. The new esteem cancels the previous Hispanophobic approach to the Quixotic figure, but it collides with the lingering Hispanophobia: even if this latter may be abating as Spain loses its hegemony, it retains enough force through political rivalry to keep prejudice alive. It is no surprise then if new strategies to cope with the Hispanophobic paradox still lurking in the ever-growing reputation of *Don Quixote* are devised. We are now going to see how two politicians who took an active part in that rivalry but were also admirers of *Don Quixote* negotiated this tension in new ways, thus adding further possibilities to Fuchs’s inventory. And we will conclude by going beyond the time span of the sources she examines and showing how the emergence of a new interpretation of *Don Quixote* and its fortunate coincidence with a most rare bout of English Hispanophilia put an end – no matter how inconclusive – to this ambivalence at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

**Eighteenth-century Quixotics**

The reception of *Don Quixote* in the eighteenth century is well known for a change in the interpretation of the Quixotic figure from an object of ridicule to one of admiration. This is epitomized by Henry Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews* (1742) and Corbyn Morris’s *Essay towards Fixing the True Standards of Wit, Humour, Raillery, Satire and Ridicule* (1744, 1758), both of which transform the Quixotic madness into whim or foible and idealism or innocence. Fielding does so through the most famous English avatar of the Spanish Don, Parson Adams; Morris through his alignment of Don Quixote with Falstaff and Sir Roger de Coverley. Either in fictional or essayistic form, both provide the antidote to Gayton and Butler by proposing a benevolent and good-natured although eccentric and obsessive Quixote, which results in a new character type, the so-called amiable humorist. This new interpretation of the Quixotic figure originates a surging tide of what we can call philoquixotism (sympathy for the character), which is a limiting our view of the Spanish connection’ (p. 4). The paradox is that Spanish hegemony in politics produces cultural hegemony and results in irresistible fascination, imitation and literary traffic, but political antagonism prevents acknowledging it, thus creating a dynamics of emulation and occlusion.
part of the larger tide of Quixotephilia (appreciation of the work). Its later landmarks include Jarvis’s translation (1742), Lennox’s The Female Quixote (1752), Smollett’s translation (1755) and imitation (Sir Launcelot Greaves, 1760-1761), and John Bowle’s annotated edition in Spanish (1781).14

The rise of philoquixotism reverses the situation of the seventeenth century, when the negative interpretation of the Quixotic figure chimes with a pre-existing one of the country where he was born, and places us at the crux of the paradox defining the eighteenth century, when remaining Hispanophilia goes hand in hand with emerging Quixotephilia. This Cervantine turn to the old paradox between political hostility and literary admiration is best expressed by two representatives who attempt to minimize it in two different though related ways: (i) the reading of Don Quixote as a satire and, more specifically, as a satire against Spain, which provides further justification for Hispanophobia, particularly because this negative view of Spain is voiced by a most eminent Spaniard, Cervantes; (ii) the canonization of Don Quixote as a classic, which both legitimizes that Hispanophobic view encoded in it and severs the work from its Spanish original soil by promoting it to a privileged place in the universal canon, beyond Hispanophobia. Unsurprisingly, these two attitudes are embodied by two politicians of the utmost importance in English history: perhaps their political activity made them aware of the ambivalence between the literary and the political I am describing; so they tried to mitigate it and strike a compromise.

2. William Temple: The politics of (mis)reading

Sir William Temple (1628-1699) was an active statesman and diplomat during the English Restoration period. He was throughout his political career a friend and defender of the Dutch cause, which made him a temporary ally of Spain in the common fight against France, now the hegemonic power that had already conquered part of the Spanish possessions in Flanders and meant to take the rest of them. Indeed, Temple, who was the English ambassador to The Hague for many years, had been offered the post of ambassador to Spain, but he declined it, and was even appointed as such, but never took up the post. This detail indicates where his personal allegiances lay and reminds

us that England and the Netherlands had been traditionally allies against Spain and remained so, united in their eagerness, as emerging maritime and commercial powers, to break the Spanish monopoly in American trade through piracy and attacks against the Spanish colonies. But Temple was not only a politician but also a man of letters, particularly after 1681, when he retired from public life, first to his country state at Sheen (Ireland) and then in 1686 to Moor Park (Surrey), where Jonathan Swift was his secretary from 1690 to his death in 1699. If, as a politician, he was still at odds with Spain, as a man of letters his knowledge of Spanish language and culture (he had travelled in Spain as well as other countries in his youth) put him in contact with Cervantes. We know from his essays of his admiration for *Don Quixote*, and what he wrote there was both prophetic and symptomatic of the change in the interpretation of Cervantes’s masterpiece described above. In this way, his mediating position between evolving views of Spain can be correlated to one between evolving views of *Don Quixote*, which places him at the crossroads of Hispanophobic quixotism and Quixotephilia.

In his famous ‘An Essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning’, Temple introduces *Don Quixote* as an example of the dangers of ridiculing activities which are in themselves serious and praiseworthy:

An ingenious Spaniard at Brussels would needs have it that the history of Don Quixot had ruined the Spanish monarchy; for before that time, love and valour were all romance among them; every young cavalier that entered the scene, dedicated the services of his life, to his honour first, and then to his mistress. They lived and died in this romantic vein. [...] After *Don Quixot* appeared, and with that inimitable wit and humour, turned all this romantic honour and love into ridicule, the Spaniards, he said, began to grow ashamed of both, and to laugh at fighting and loving, or at least otherwise than to pursue their fortune, or satisfy their lust; and the consequences of this, both upon their bodies and their minds, this Spaniard would needs have it pass for a great cause of the ruin of Spain, or of its greatness and power.15

The passage is significant for two reasons. On the one hand, there is a new literary interpretation which transforms what was initially understood as a comic parody or burlesque of chivalric romances into a very serious satire on chivalry and chivalric values: the butt is not a genre of literature but a way of life – honour, valour, love, i.e. fighting and loving – and hence

15 Included in his *Five Miscellaneous Essays*, p. 70.
a whole country, Spain, that lived by those values. This implies, of course, the ridicule or derision of the character representing them, Don Quixote, which is in tune with the prevailing view at the time. On the other hand, there is a political interpretation, since Temple blames the work and the manner it discredits that way of life and those values for the decadence of Spain and the ruin of the Spanish monarchy, thus endowing literature, as Fuchs has argued, with an enormous as well as devastating power. This political reading is somehow legitimized by invoking a Spanish source, a Spaniard at Brussels (the capital of Flanders and hence Spanish territory), as if protecting himself from the charge of Hispanophobia by making clear that this anti-Spanish reading of Don Quixote has Spanish origins.

The political bias underlying this new interpretation is even clearer if we turn to an earlier example of it which might have triggered Temple’s view, as Burton has elucidated.17 In his *Reflexions sur la poétique d’Aristote et sur les ouvrages des poètes anciens et modernes* (1674), translated into English the very same year by Thomas Rymer, René Rapin wrote:

> [Don Quixote was] compos’d by Cervantes, Secretary to the Duke of Alva. This great man having been slighted, and received some disgrace by the Duke of Lerma chief Minister of State to Philip III, who had no respect for Men of Learning, writ the Romance of Don Quixot, which is a most fine and ingenious Satyr on his own Countrey; because the Nobility of Spain, whom he renders ridiculous by this work, were all bit in the head and intoxicated with Knight-errantry.18

In this view, which was spread throughout Europe because it was included by Louis Moréri in *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique* (1683), translated into several European languages,19 Don Quixote is not just a political satire, but one against one particular politician or aristocrat and the Spanish aristocracy in general. The interpretation is an obvious expression of French resentment against the former hegemonic power now on the wane and replaced by France after the Peace of Westphalia (1648), the Duke of Lerma being the valido or chief minister of the king of Spain in Cervantes’s times, and hence representing the Spanish monarchy. This Hispanophobic flavour is
intensified in a later English variation. In his *Serious Reflections during the Life and Strange Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1720), Daniel Defoe makes Crusoe declare that the satirical butt of *Don Quixote* was not the Duke of Lerma, but the Duke of Medina-Sidonia. He is thus turning Don Quixote into a disguised portrait or emblem of the commander-in-chief of the Spanish Armada, and hence bringing into the picture the episode that could be considered the original sin of English Hispanophobia. The implication is that the duke was a Quixote, and so were the Spaniards attempting to conquer England, as Paulson has argued, but also that, even more than one century later, the memory of that episode remains vivid in the English imaginary to the point of allegorizing it in *Don Quixote*.

Defoe makes obvious what is implicit in Rapin and Temple: the projection of Hispanophobia onto the character through an anti-Spanish reading of the novel, so the Quixote is still Hispanophobic, but in a more openly and unmistakably political way than in Gayton. This is even more the case if we take into account that Temple is usually accorded the merit of having placed Cervantes in the literary Parnassus by including him on a list of the great modern classical authors: ‘Of the Italians, Boccace, Machiavel, and Padre Paolo; Among the Spaniards, Cervantes (that writ *Don Quixot*) and Guevara; Among the French, Rabelais, and Montagne.’ The new status granted to Cervantes may be the true rationale behind importing this political reading of his masterpiece into England: to make this new prestige as a classic, which the work acquires in the eighteenth century, not just compatible with England’s traditionally hostile view of Spain, but even palatable to English readers. Perhaps that is why there are so many echoes of this political reading in the initial decades of the eighteenth century, for example in Peter Motteux’s ‘An Account of the Author’, which precedes the third volume of his influential translation of *Don Quixote* (1700-1703); in the newspaper articles by Richard Steele, who testifies to the connection of this view to Whig politics studied by Paulson in his *Don Quixote in England*; or in the *Memoirs of Captain Carleton* (1728) by Daniel Defoe. And, even later, we can still find allusions or references to this interpretation in the authors listed by Burton: William Warburton in 1737, William Collins in 1747, and Horace Walpole in 1774.

20 Paulson, *Don Quixote in England*, p. 34.
22 Motteux, ‘An Account of the Author’.
23 See Burton, ‘Cervantes the Man’, p. 4.
24 Walpole expressed it in a very synthetic way when he wrote in a letter to Sir Horace Mann of 10 July 1774 that ‘Cervantes laughed chivalry out of fashion’ (quoted in Burton, ‘Cervantes
Temple thus inaugurates a new view of *Don Quixote* as what may be termed the Hispanophobic classic, which will predominate in the first half of the eighteenth century. The character representing Spanish noblemen and Spain is still implicitly denigrated, as in Gayton and his Hispanophobic Quixote, but the work is now explicitly exalted through the new neoclassical seriousness of satire that Temple’s commentary bestows on *Don Quixote*. The novel is thus seen in a quite different light from the seventeenth-century view of it as a comedy of low humour or a farcical burlesque of chivalric romance. The paradox now is that the political denigration of Spain goes hand in hand with the literary exaltation of Cervantes and his work. William Temple’s half-way position between these two spheres, the literary and the political, placed him in a privileged vantage point to negotiate this ambivalence and to integrate the political animosity against a rival nation with the appreciation of its most outstanding masterpiece. This he does by identifying the Quixotic character with Spain through a deliberate and political (mis)reading of *Don Quixote*, and then turning Cervantes against Spain through a satirical reading of the work (not very different, in this respect, from the one applied to *Lazarillo de Tormes*), or, in other words, by turning Cervantes into a political ally, since his masterpiece contributed to the desirable – to English eyes – decline of Spain. Hispanophobia thus adopts a new guise, perhaps the most sophisticated or insidious one: Quixotephilia. If it had turned from occlusion to denigration with Gayton, now it is disguised under the new interpretation and canonization with Temple. This will be the path to be followed by another eminent British politician and man of letters.

3. Lord Carteret: The politics of canonization

The satirical interpretation first formulated in England by Temple certainly paved the way for the canonization of the work, which materialized in the deluxe edition sponsored by another diplomat and politician, Sir John Carteret, Earl of Granville (1690-1763). It was published in 1738 by the London publisher Jacob Tonson with the title *Vida y hechos del ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*, and this is its first remarkable feature: it is an edition in Spanish published in England. What makes it a landmark in
the English reception of *Don Quixote*, though, is not the language, but the fact that it makes visible the new status of *Don Quixote* as a classic. This is highlighted by these further features:

(i) the care taken by Peter Pineda, a teacher of Spanish, in establishing the text through consultation of the first Spanish editions;
(ii) the luxurious presentation of its four volumes: the large size and prime quality of paper, print type, and binding;
(iii) the new set of illustrations (68: an unprecedented number), most of them by John Vanderbank, including the allegorical frontispiece representing ‘Cervantes as Hercules Mussagetes liberating Mount Parnassus from the monstrous invaders of fantastic literature’; – a visual emblem of Cervantes’s accession to the status of classic – and the first portrait of Cervantes ever engraved (by George Vertue after William Kent’s original);
(iv) the first biography of Cervantes ever written, by Gregorio Mayans y Siscar, librarian of the Spanish Crown, commissioned by Lord Carteret through the English ambassador to Spain, Benjamin Keene;
(v) the dedication by Carteret to the Contessa de Montijo, the wife of the Spanish Ambassador in London and a friend of Carteret’s, in which he adopts Temple’s satirical view by referring to the salutary effects of Cervantes’s work (of course, salutary for English interests).

For all these reasons, Carteret’s is considered the first monumental edition insofar as, using Schmidt’s description, it is ‘the first monument to the novel’s author’ in any European language, antedating the Spanish deluxe edition of the Real Academia (1780) by more than 40 years. But it is also

26 Carteret declares that he admires Cervantes as ‘one of those inestimable figures who [...] by the fertility of his immortal genius, has produced (albeit through burlesque) the most serious, useful, and salutary effects that can be imagined’ (quoted in Paulson, *Don Quixote in England*, p. 47). Paulson’s remarks on these words provide an insight into the connection of the satirical interpretation of *Don Quixote* to home politics and not just foreign or Spanish affairs: ‘Carteret’s politics were Whig. [...] The Whigs continued to associate *Don Quixote* and Quixote’s madness of knight-errantry with the Jacobite-Tory nostalgia for the Cavaliers. There may be some significance in Carteret’s undertaking his edition of the Quixote following the Jacobite uprising of 1715 and the Atterbury “plot” of 1722’ (p. 47). Paulson is pointing to the same association of quixotism with the Cavaliers that we tentatively posited in Gayton.
27 Schmidt, *Critical Images*, p. 49: ‘The publication of the first Cervantine biography and portrait, as well as the sheer size and physical sumptuousness of the book, paper, binding, print type, and illustrations, mark the edition as a physical and intellectual venture intended to launch Cervantes from the realm of popular literature on to the ethereal heights of Parnassus’.
the monument to English Quixotephilia, since it was a physical as well as intellectual landmark in the incorporation of *Don Quixote* into the literary canon.

This overt will to canonize *Don Quixote* goes hand in hand not just with the satirical interpretation suggested by Lord Carteret’s dedication, but also with a further change within this interpretation, which transfers the newly gained seriousness of the work to the character himself. This is carried out in the illustrations, which, as Martínez Mata has aptly explained, involve an important shift in the iconographic model that had previously been dominant.28 Unlike the model followed by Charles-Antoine Coypel in his illustrations dating from 1724 and published in England in 1725, which reinforce the lowliness and comicality of the Quixotic figure and the work as a whole, Vanderbank’s images invest character and book with a new seriousness and decorum.29 Two facts point to the deliberate nature of this change: firstly, the comparison with the illustrations prepared for the same edition by William Hogarth, of which only one was accepted and six were rejected; this rejection shows, secondly, how iconography responded to a clear idea and plan on the part of Carteret and, particularly, his collaborator John Oldfield, who instructed the artists and chose the scenes to be represented – excluding the most farcical and grotesque ones – in accordance with a more respectful conception of the Quixotic figure.30 This latter, even if still the butt of satire, was now invested with a dignity that redeemed him from the degradation of the Hispanophobic Quixote and put him on the way to becoming the admirable figure that emerged only four years later with Fielding. Or, in other words, the iconographic model goes beyond Quixotephilia to anticipate the philoquixotism that defines the second half of the eighteenth century and the subsequent rise of the Romantic Quixote.31

The disappearance of the Hispanophobic Quixote in the illustrations does not mean that the prejudice against Spain has vanished from the edition: it simply has been transferred from the character and the work to the writer and his life. By this I do not mean that Cervantes is presented under disadvantageous light in Mayans’s biography, assembled from the

---

28 Martínez Mata, ‘El cambio de interpretación del *Quijote*’, pp. 203-205.
30 Ibid., p. 48.
31 This is best observed in the initial illustration representing Don Quixote reading in his tidy, English-style library, which emphasizes his gentility instead of his madness and captures him in a very dignified pose connecting him with previous representations of melancholy, as Martínez Mata, whose comparison between Vanderbank’s and Hogarth’s images I am following here, has argued (‘El cambio de interpretación del *Quijote*’, p. 204).
information the author had provided about himself in the prefatory materials of his books. On the contrary, from the very beginning the Life stresses two significant facts: his youthful heroism in Lepanto (from the prologue to Novelas Ejemplares) and his poverty in old age (from the dedication of Don Quixote II), as Martínez Mata explains. If we put them together, we get a narrative of a hero as well as a great writer rewarded with poverty and neglect by his country, and hence a representation of the ingratitude of a Spain unable to appreciate either talent or bravery (arms and letters). This is precisely what Mayans also emphasizes in the dedication of his Life to Lord Carteret and what the latter throws into relief in his dedication of the edition to the Contessa of Montijo, when he writes of Cervantes that ‘los hombres más poderosos de su tiempo no se avergonzaban dejarle en la suma pobreza’. There is no better proof of how quickly and how deeply this Hispanophobic image will be imprinted on the English imaginary. It will set the tone for later biographies, for example that produced by Smollett for his translation of Don Quixote (1755), in which the author is glorified in inverse proportion to the denigration of the country. This creates an implicit contrast between a Spain that did not recognize Cervantes’s genius, and a Britain that does. Or, put another way, Britain makes amends to Cervantes for Spanish mistreatment: he will find in England the position he did not in Spain, as Lord Carteret’s edition itself proves.

This very subtle Hispanophobia underlying Cervantes’s canonization becomes more apparent when the political circumstances in which the book was produced are examined. Lord Carteret was extraordinarily learned both in literature and languages, including Spanish, and hence his interest in Cervantes, but he represented the most antagonistic or even belligerent position against Spain in contemporary English politics. As Álvarez Faedo explains, the same year that this edition of Don Quixote appeared, Carteret was leading the Whig opposition in Parliament and manoeuvring for a declaration of war against Spain in order to defend the...

32 Ibid., pp. 205-206.
33 ‘The most powerful men of his time were not ashamed of leaving him in sheer poverty’, quoted in Ibid., p. 206.
34 Of course, this negative representation of Spain is even more damaging because it comes from a Spaniard, recalling Temple’s citing of a Spaniard in Brussels – Martínez Mata (ibid., p. 206) even suggests the possibility of Mayans’s identification with Don Quixote in the lack of appreciation and alienation he felt at court. The fact that this first biography is written by a Spaniard certainly clears all later English biographers of any suspicions of Hispanophobia, even if Mayans’s representation of Cervantes is conceptualized in nationalistic terms through the implicit contrast with England.
English right to trade in South America without Spanish interference (in the indirect form of tribute paid or in the direct hindrance by the Spanish coast guards preventing English ships from reaching the harbours of Spanish colonies). He eventually succeeded, and the War of Jenkin’s Ear (La Guerra del Asiento) started in 1739 and lasted until 1748. Furthermore, Álvarez Faedo points to the possibility that Carteret’s edition was meant as a gift for Queen Caroline in an unashamed attempt at pleasing her and gaining her esteem. If we consider the queen’s influence on all political decisions and appointments made by her husband, George II, it is evident that this was a political move on Carteret’s part designed to increase his influence and further his ambitions against Prime Minister Robert Walpole, who, unlike Carteret, was reluctant to declare war on Spain. In this light, the edition of *Don Quixote* can be described as the means to enable Carteret to pursue his anti-Spanish policy. We see how, once more, Cervantes is turned into a sort of political ally against Spain and his book becomes anti-Spanish, but now with an additional personal touch, for the sake of Carteret’s political career, which the edition was intended to promote.

As with Temple, Carteret’s double identity as a man of letters and a politician creates a tension between political antagonism and literary admiration, but the underlying ambivalence in Temple now becomes an open paradox: the edition that turned *Don Quixote* into a classic was sponsored by somebody who was also campaigning for war against Spain, in an effort to place himself in a position to make that war happen. The paradox is resolved, not just through the satirical interpretation implied in the dedication and learned from Temple, which endows the novel with the neoclassical seriousness of satire and vilifies the country exposed in it: here the canonization initiated by Temple is more decisive because fully accomplished. Canonizing *Don Quixote* cuts off the ties of nationality by making it the property of the world and not of a particular country, and this is reinforced by the biography which alienates Cervantes from Spain. But the biography also points to appropriation, since it implies that Britain is giving Cervantes the recognition his own country denied him, by producing the first monumental edition and thus naturalizing him as English. In addition, by removing the farcical and burlesque view of the Quixote figure, at least in visual form through the illustrations, the last obstacle for the English

35 See Álvarez Faedo, ‘Lord Carteret y Cervantes’.
36 Curiously enough, Carteret had intervened as a diplomat in the peace treaty of 1721 which ended the 1719 war between the two countries in Italy. We see here, as in Temple’s case, the ambivalence between the political and the literary within the political relations with Spain.
appropriation is removed: once fully freed from Hispanophobic negativity, he can become an English character, as Fielding and Morris will realize just a few years later. The ensuing wave of philoquixotism represents a new landmark in the reception of *Don Quixote* in England: from now on the new amiable English Quixote, and not the anti-quixotic and Hispanophobic one, mediates the interpretation of Cervantes’s masterpiece for English readers and explains its adoption as an English classic.

**Conclusion**

4. **The Hispanophilic Quixote and Lord Byron**

Temple and Carteret are key figures in the political reception of *Don Quixote*, a reception anchored in or at least mediated by their political activities and hence by the antagonism between England and Spain. Their interpretation of Cervantes’s novel and its promotion to the status of classic alleviates the ambivalence and tension between political phobia and literary philia presiding over Anglo-Hispanic relations ever since the sixteenth century, but there is another possibility of relief of this tension: a radical change in those political relations. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Napoleonic invasion of Spain and the uprising of the Spanish people against the French invader, Britain’s archenemy, suddenly turned Spain and England into unexpected allies. The Peninsular War (La Guerra de la Independencia, 1808-1814) marked a turning point in Anglo-Hispanic relations and created in British public opinion a tide of sympathy for Spain, now transformed into the champion of oppressed peoples in the struggle for freedom against Napoleon.

Richard Hitchcock has provided ample evidence of how the Peninsular War created a vogue for Spain in Britain, which he extends to 1850. Hitchcock also explains that it was fostered by the accounts of Spain written by English combatants who, in their turn, encouraged a flood of English travellers who converted Spain into an alternative to the Grand Tour routes to France and Italy. This combined with the new Romantic interest in Spain and the Mediterranean – already visible in the Gothic romance, but more evident in some Romantics such as Scott, Southey, and Byron. The war also contributed to a new romanticized and positive image of Spain in the form of the English war poetry anthologized by Agustín Coletes and Alicia Laspra.\(^{37}\) Perhaps

\(^{37}\) Hitchcock, ‘Reflections'; Coletes and Laspra Rodríguez, *Libertad frente a tiranía*. 
the most famous and representative poem is Felicia Hemans’s *England and Spain* (1808), whose subtitle, *Valour and Patriotism*, perfectly epitomizes the exalting and patriotic light shed on Spain. If we take into account that Spain was also in the course of losing most of its American colonies in South America and ceasing to be a competitor for Britain in that last battleground of its former supremacy, it is not far-fetched to argue that Hispanophobia turns now into Hispanophilia, or at least into a more muted or soft form of Hispanophobia, condescending and patronizing because Britain is now the empire that Spain once was (as Fernando Durán also suggests in his contribution to this book).38

What is interesting is that this turn coincides with a parallel one in the reception of *Don Quixote* in Britain, making this new view of Spain chime with the extremely favourable one of the Quixote figure. The Romantic interpretation, which originated in Germany but found in English philoquixotism the ideal conditions for acclimatization, sees the Don as a champion of the ideal and views the book in heroic and tragic terms, as the story of a hero doomed to failure by a prosaic and debased world and producing tears instead of laughter. Don Quixote is no longer associated with satire or his original Spanish soil but has become a universal symbol in the larger struggle of the ideal against the real, imagination against reality, poetry against prose. Thus Cervantes becomes an essential asset of the European or Western heritage, as his usual pairing with Shakespeare proves, and his novel reaches the climax of Quixotephilia. This view was formulated in English quite late, in John Lockhart’s preface to the 1822 edition of Motteux’s translation and in the *History of Spanish and Portuguese Literature* (1823), a translation by Thomasina Ross of volume III of Bouterwek’s *Geschichte der Poesie und Beredsamkeit seit dem Ende des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts*

38 As a matter of fact, we should talk of mixed feelings, as confirmed by Mª Eugenia Perojo Arronte in her examination of Coleridge’s writing on Spain, where she detects traces of the Black Legend coexisting with the new patriotic and heroic vein (‘Coleridge and Spanish Literature’, p. 96), which justifies her assertion that ‘Coleridge is one of the British Romantics who held conflicting views of Spain’ (p. 95). Coletes also detects the same ambivalence with regard to Byron, in whose *The Bronze Age* one can find the poet ‘resorting to a time-honoured stereotype, the Spanish black legend’, but ‘this was compatible for the British Romantics with a very recent re-birth for the old “heroic Spain” image’ (‘Spain and Byron’, p. 123) as a result of the Peninsular War, when ‘the Spaniards were newly seen by their British allies as fierce freedom fighters […] Walter Scott and Robert Southey, among others, had combined both views of Spain in their Peninsular War writing, and so does Byron’ (p. 124). Consequently, ambivalence between Hispanophobia and Hispanophilia is no longer a tension between the literary and the political but is incorporated into this latter to produce what we could call condescending Hispanophilia or soft – because Hispanophilic – Hispanophobia.
(1801-1809). But it had been in the air earlier, with Samuel Taylor Coleridge as one of its main advocates and publicists.\(^3^9\)

I am not suggesting a causal relationship between the change in the perception of Spain and that of Don Quixote but pointing out that they profit from each other and are mutually beneficial. The bout of Hispanophilia I have just described undoubtedly helped to popularize the exaggerated sympathy with which Don Quixote was seen in the new German Romantic vein. And it may have worked inversely too: the new Romantic view of *Don Quixote* should have increased the sympathy for Spain. Indeed, Spain was frequently seen through Cervantes’s masterpiece, as attested by the many references to the work Esther Ortas has compiled in her very informative account of travel literature in Spain from 1701 to 1846, and particularly by Henry D. Inglis’s *Rambles in the Footsteps of Don Quixote* (1831, 1837).\(^4^0\) What is beyond contention is that the pairing of Don Quixote with Spain has been rebuilt in harmonious instead of conflictual terms, as had been the case with Gayton’s Hispanophobic Quixote, but now in Hispanophilic instead of Hispanophobic fashion. After the troubled times of ambivalence caused by the conflict between literary admiration and political antagonism, there is again full agreement in the perception of Don Quixote and Spain, but in positive instead of negative terms. The integration of both in a sort of Romantic matrix puts an end to the paradox I have been exploring.

The new Hispanophilic Quixote is best seen in a major figure like Lord Byron. His judgement on *Don Quixote* in the first line of stanza xi, canto XIII,

\(^3^9\) Coleridge had embarked on a ten-month journey to Germany on 16 September 1798 and had studied at the University of Göttingen for four months in 1799. He was well read in German literature and philosophy, as his frequent plagiarisms of so many ideas from German authors in his writings prove. Of his ideas on *Don Quixote*, we have the evidence of the three lectures he gave (in 1814, 1818, and 1819, see Perojo Arronte, ‘Coleridge and Spanish Literature’, pp. 107-108), although there are earlier references in his writings, particularly the notes he took for the second one and the report on it appearing in the *New Times* (23 February 1818), where we can find an excellent introduction to the Romantic approach to *Don Quixote*. In addition to the lectures, he could disseminate his ideas in private conversations with intellectuals and poets of his circle, as Hazlitt’s remarks on *Don Quixote* in his often quoted ‘Standard Novels and Romances’ (1815) suggest. For an exhaustive account of Coleridge’s ideas on Cervantes, see Perojo Arronte, ‘Samuel Taylor Coleridge on *Don Quixote*’.

\(^4^0\) As I have explained elsewhere (Pardo, ‘Henry David Inglis’), this is a fictional Quixotic travelogue – an account by a traveller following the Quixotic trail – in which *Don Quixote* is seen through Spain and Spain through *Don Quixote*, but, of course, this means the Romantic version of the work, not Cervantes’s, in the same way as Spain is Romantic Spain. Inglis’s book shows how the new view of the novel perfectly suits that of the country and testifies to the transformation of Spain from potential threat to Romantic other.
of *Don Juan* (1821) has been quoted repeatedly: ‘Cervantes smiled Spanish chivalry away’. The idea sounds deceptively similar to Temple’s reading (through Walpole’s rephrasing of it): *Don Quixote* was a satire on chivalry which erased the latter from Spain through burlesque.\(^4\) Less frequently quoted are the preceding stanzas (viii to x), which reveal the differences with Temple:

I should be very willing to redress  
Men’s wrongs, and rather check than punish crimes,  
Had not Cervantes, in that too true tale  
Of Quixote, shown how all such efforts fail.  

Of all tales ’tis the saddest – and more sad  
Because he makes us smile. His hero’s right  
And still pursues the right: to curb the bad  
His only object, and ’gainst odds to fight  
His guerdon. ’Tis his virtue makes him mad.  
But his adventures form a sorry sight;  
A sorrier still is the great moral taught  
By that real epic unto all who have thought.\(^4\)

These lines clearly articulate the Romantic positive interpretation stressing Quixotic heroism in the face of a hostile reality and the tragedy of its failure. The oft-quoted line may have seemed the same idea, since it implies the view of *Don Quixote* as a satire against chivalry resulting in the disappearance of heroism, but Byron does not rejoice in it. He regrets it because he supports chivalry and quixotism, which is described as heroic idealism. Unlike Temple, he is on the side of Don Quixote rather than Cervantes, and this can be extended to Spain, since he obviously considers the effects of his work as damaging rather than salutary.

This is confirmed by the view of Spain Byron provided in a former poem, the one that made his name famous overnight all over Europe, *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage*, the first canto of which (1812) recounts his experience as a traveller in Spain in 1809. There are two famous stanzas where he voices his Hispanophilia in the context of the Peninsular War, as displayed in their first lines: ‘Oh, lovely Spain! renowned, romantic land! / Where is that standard which Pelagio bore’ (xxxv); and ‘Awake, ye sons of Spain! awake! advance! / Lo! Chivalry,

---

\(^4\) See note 8.  
\(^4\) Byron, *Don Juan*, p. 1138.
your ancient goddess, cries' (xxxvii).43 Byron is calling the Spanish people to arms against foreign oppression, and his invocation of Spain's glorious and chivalric past represented by Don Pelayo is a clear correlate to his evocation of lost chivalry represented by Don Quixote in Don Juan. Indeed, one line in stanza x of Don Juan XIII (following those on Cervantes previously quoted and preceding the one containing the famous dictum), which reads ‘From foreign yoke to free the helpless native’, rings the bell of the Peninsular War and links Don Quixote to the struggle for freedom in Spain formerly invoked at length in Childe Harold. The lines from this latter thus provide an additional context to Byron's interpretation of Cervantes's work: the poet is not the political enemy of Spain satisfied by the salutary effects of satire on that country, but rather the sympathetic ally who feels nostalgia for Spain's heroic past – pre-imperial, leaping back to a time before Anglo-Hispanic antagonism – and promotes its renewal in the fight against the foreign tyrant.44

In short, Temple’s interpretation is now tinged by Hispanophilia instead of Hispanophobia. Byron's political as well as literary ideas, in this case his identification with the Spanish people and Don Quixote, colour his reading of Cervantes, although the Hispanophobic view of the novel as anti-Spanish satire is still ingrained in Byron's view. This persistence, in conjunction with the survival of the Black Legend alongside Spanish heroism in the writings of the Romantics on Spain, reveals the resilience of Hispanophobia at the heart of Hispanophilia. As the latter wanes, the paradox lying at the core of Britain's

43 These are the two complete stanzas: [xxxv] ‘Oh, lovely Spain! renowned, romantic land! / Where is that standard which Pelagio bore, / When Cava's traitor-sire first called the band / That dyed thy mountain-streams with Gothic gore? / Where are those bloody banners which of yore / Waved o'er thy sons, victorious to the gale, / And drove at last the spoilers to their shore? / Red gleamed the cross, and waned the crescent pale, / While Afric's echoes thrilled with Moorish matrons' wail’ (p. 35); [xxxvii] ‘Awake, ye sons of Spain! awake! advance! / Lo! Chivalry, your ancient goddess, cries, / But wields not, as of old, her thirsty lance, / Nor shakes her crimson plumage in the skies: / Now on the smoke of blazing bolts she flies, / And speaks in thunder through yon engine's roar! / In every peal she calls – 'Awake! arise!' / Say, is her voice more feeble than of yore, / When her war-song was heard on Andalusia's shore?’ (Byron, Byron’s Poetry, p. 36).

44 Stanza x of Don Juan XIII reads as follows: ‘Redressing injury, revenging wrong, / To aid the damsel and destroy the caitiff, / Opposing singly the united strong, / From foreign yoke to free the helpless native. / Alas, must noblest views like an old song / Be for mere Fancy's sport a theme creative, / A jest, a riddle, fame through thick and thin sought? / And Socrates himself but Wisdom's Quixote?’ (p. 1138). For the presence and importance of Spain in Byron's poetry and life, see Saglia, Byron and Spain. Saglia also studies Byron in his Poetic Castles in Spain, specifically in one section of chapter 1 (‘Patriotic Knights and Matadors in Byron's Childe Harold’, pp. 125-143) and in the last section of chapter 2 (‘Spain in Ottava Rima: Byron’s Don Juan and Barry Cornwall’s Diego de Montilla’, pp. 238-243).
relationship with Cervantes must return to the beaten track and Don Quixote needs to be dissociated from Spain again. In this light, the canonization of Cervantes starting in the eighteenth century and culminating in Romantic criticism is but preparation for the final blow to be dealt by the Victorian age: full appropriation through a process of naturalization and Don Quixote’s metamorphosis into a recognizably English character and of the novel into an English classic. This process can be seen as an extension to the literary field of the politics of colonization, which will turn Britain into an empire in the nineteenth century. With this outcome in view, we can conclude that, in the long love story between Britain and Don Quixote, Spain was first a nuisance to be disposed of through occlusion or denigration; then a hindrance to be overcome by misreading or canonization; later an officious helper or go-between in the wings of short-lived Hispanophilia; and finally, after consummation in wedlock – that is, appropriation – a silent observer to be witness, if not an annoying in-law to be tolerated.
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