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**Abstract**

In the editorial history of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra’s masterpiece, *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quixote de la Mancha* (1605, 1615), one of its signal events was the landmark edition published in London in 1738. The result of an unusual Anglo-Spanish collaboration commissioned by an English nobleman, the project may have been set in motion by his exchange with a Hanoverian princess newly arrived in Great Britain. This major editorial undertaking and two strong personalities — one directly involved, the other only possibly pertinent — occupy the following pages. The legendary Merlin the sorcerer plays a dual role and links the two, as a personality in the Quixote and as the name of a collection of books of fiction that later became the site of an amusement-park-style spectacle at a royal London residence. These intertwined stories reveal how canonical literature and popular legend can serve the twin pursuits of cultural prestige and historical standing.

In 1738 there appeared in London a landmark edition of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra’s early seventeenth-century masterpiece, *El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*.¹ It was published in the original Spanish, and it contained sixty-eight full-page copper engravings, which was an unheard-of number. It appeared under the title *Vida y hechos del*  

---

1. Don Quixote or Don Quijote? Until the early 19th century, the phonemes of j or g (the latter, before e or i) were represented with an x, but in 1815 the Spanish Royal Academy’s *Ortografía de la lengua española* eliminated the use of x with phonic value and replaced it orthographically with the j and, before e or i with g (Lapesa [1942] 1988, 204, 423–24). From the first publication of Cervantes’s novel in 1605 and 1615, as well as in the Carteret edition of 1738 and the Spanish Royal Academy’s edition of 1780, Quixote prevailed. I will use the antique spelling here because it was used in the period I am discussing, even though the modern spelling is Quijote.
ingenioso hidalgo don Quixote de la Mancha, and it was heralded as the first luxury edition of Cervantes’s masterpiece.2 It also spurred further editorial efforts, notably, four decades later, the Spanish Royal Academy’s handsome four-volume edition, titled El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha (Madrid, 1780). How did the remarkable London edition of 1738 come about? Lord John Carteret, later Earl Granville, initiated this multi-year project in the 1720s. He worked with artists and engravers in England, even after he was posted to Dublin as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He commissioned the London-based Spanish lexicographer Pedro Pineda to review and correct the Spanish-language text. He augmented it with an important (actually, the first-ever published) account of the life of Cervantes, written by the great Valencian scholar Don Gregorio Mayáns y Siscar. Lord Carteret’s friend, Dr. John Oldfield, provided an essay on the rationale for the edition’s engraved illustrations that included an explanation of its allegorical frontispiece. Rounded out by Mayáns’s tribute to Carteret3 and Carteret’s (unsigned) dedication of the work to the Countess of Montijo, the four-volume quarto edition was published by Jacob and Richard Tonson, the heirs of the great London publishing house founded by Jacob Tonson the Elder in the 1670s. This dizzying display of Anglo-Spanish literary, artistic, and editorial collaboration demands closer attention.

Was it inspired by a German princess? The Princess of Wales, later Queen Consort to King George II, Caroline of Brandenburg-Ansbach (German: Karoline von Brandenburg-Ansbach) (1683–1737) may have served as its originating muse. There are at least two versions of the story; like all such origin myths, this one generated opposing interpretations: Did Lord Carteret propose to provide Caroline with a fine edition of the Quixote, or did Caroline ask Carteret to add Cervantes’s masterpiece to her collection of fictional books? Because the only available accounts are at second- and third hand (notably, Mayáns y Siscar 1792, Ashbee 1893, Hammelmann 1969, Hammelmann 1975), it is impossible to tell. Perhaps, in fact, the tale is apocryphal. But if there were such a fateful meeting, when and where did it occur? I begin with its originating anecdotes before

2. Thus it has been considered from the time of its eighteenth-century publication through this century: Cervantes de Saavedra [1605, 1615] 1780, 1: Aijji, Navarrete 1819, 204–05, Ashbee 1895, 20, Lenaghan 2003,179. For the 1738 edition’s detailed bibliographic description, see Ashbee 1895, 19–20.

3. Mayáns y Siscar (1737) had also included this tribute to Lord Carteret in Vida de Miguel de Cervantes de Saavedra that he had published independently the previous year in Madrid.
taking up the more serious question: the making of Lord Carteret’s edition of *Vida y hechos del ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*.

**The Brothers Mayáns y Síscar, Gregorio and Juan Antonio**

In his prologue to the sixth edition of Luis Gálvez de Montalvo’s *El pastor de Fílida* (1582) published in 1792, Juan Antonio Mayáns y Síscar (1718–1801) lauded the Spanish Royal Academy’s edition of the *Quixote* that had appeared a decade earlier, in 1780. He pointed out that it updated the account of Cervantes’s life that his brother, Gregorio Mayáns y Síscar (1699–1781), had written for the great London edition of 1738 (Mayáns y Síscar 1792, xxxv).\(^4\) Juan Antonio had spent most of that decade (1733–1739) in Madrid, working as secretary and copyist to his brother. During those years, from 1730 to 1739, Gregorio served as Royal Librarian to Philip V (1683–1746), the first Bourbon king of Spain, during his second reign (1724–1746).\(^5\) At Lord Carteret’s behest, Gregorio researched and wrote his account of Cervantes’s life while serving as Philip’s librarian. Working alongside him, Juan Antonio must have become acquainted with his brother’s account of how Lord Carteret’s project had been initiated.

Identifying Caroline as the Queen of England, the wife of George II, Juan Antonio writes that she had gathered for her entertainment a collection of books of an inventive nature, and that she called it ‘the library of the sage Merlin’ (*La Biblioteca del sabio Merlín*); having shown it to the “wise connoisseur of Spanish authors” (*este sabio apreciador de los Escritores Españoles*), as Juan Antonio referred to Lord Carteret, he told her that she lacked the world’s best work of fiction, which was the *Life of Don Quixote de la Mancha*, and that he would be honored to add it to her collection (Mayáns y Síscar 1792, xxxv).\(^6\) Henry Spencer Ashbee, however, reported in 1893

---

\(^4\) Juan Antonio cites the year as 1737, which was the year that his brother Gregorio completed his account of Cervantes’s life and submitted the *Vida* to Lord Carteret but also published it separately in Madrid.

\(^5\) Paulson errs in claiming that “the first life of Cervantes was by the Spanish ambassador to England, Gregorio Mayáns y Síscar (1738)” (1998, 195n1). Gregorio Mayáns was never a diplomat, and after a decade of service as Royal Librarian, he and his brother Juan Antonio returned to Valencia to continue their scholarly pursuits.

\(^6\) This is a paraphrase of Juan Antonio’s remarks; he had written: “Carolina, Reina de Inglaterra, muger de Jorge segundo, avía juntado, para su entretenimiento, una
“without giving any authority, that the project originated from a remark by Queen Caroline to Lord Carteret complaining that she could find no edition of the novel worthy of her library” (Hammelmann 1969, 5, 14n7). Hammelmann (d. 1969) was more specific in his posthumously published study, *Book Illustrators in Eighteenth-Century England*: “it is said to have originated with Queen Caroline, presumably while still Princess of Wales”, adding that there was reason to think that, by the year 1725, “Carteret and the publisher Tonson had already resolved upon the new big edition” (1975, 81). Krahe (2003, 60) likewise identifies the Carteret-Caroline meeting as speculation but also suggests that it would have occurred during the period when Caroline was Princess of Wales. Given the chronology of Carteret’s project, any such meeting would have had to have occurred during that early period. Although Ashbee’s unsubstantiated, late nineteenth-century claim has been frequently repeated, Juan Antonio Mayáns’s testimony is the only one directly associated with one of Carteret’s original collaborators, Gregorio Mayáns y Síscar.

Colección de libros de Inventiva, i la llamava “La Bibliotheca del sabio Merlín”, i aviéndosela enseñado a Juan Baron de Carteret, le dijo este sabio apreciador de los Escritores Españoles, que faltava en ella la Ficción más agradable, que se avía escrito en el Mundo, que era la Vida de D. Quixote de la Mancha, i que él quería tener el mérito de colocarla”.

7. I have been unable to locate Ashbee’s article, “The iconography of Don Quixote”, published in the first volume of the *Translations of the Bibliographical Society* in 1893 as cited by Hammelmann (1969, 14n7). However, Ashbee makes no mention of any such Carteret-Caroline encounter in his magnum opus, *An Iconography of Don Quixote. 1605–1895*, published in London two years later, in 1895. Ashbee is remembered in the *Dictionary of National Biography* as having “compiled the finest Cervantic [sic] library out of Spain, and perhaps the finest private library of the kind anywhere, if that of Señor Bonsoms at Barcelona be excepted” (Seccombe 1901, [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionario_of_National_Biography,_1901_supplement/Ashbee,_Henry_Spencer](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Dictionario_of_National_Biography,_1901_supplement/Ashbee,_Henry_Spencer)). Ashbee, writing about his own work, identifies Bonsoms: “When the present work was well in the press and it was too late for any alteration to be made in its plan or arrangement, there appeared at Barcelona, January 1895, the No. 680 of *La Ilustración Artística*. [. . .] On the principle of the Iconografía, the Ilustración gives numerous facsimiles of rare title-pages, of illustrations, and of portraits of Cervantes, many of these belong to editions which I have already described. The collection upon which the articles in the *Ilustración* are based is owned by D.Isidro Bonsoms of Barcelona” (1895, 173).

8. Juan Antonio’s use of the epithet, “el sabio Merlín”, is a phrase that Cervantes used on at least four occasions to describe the legendary wizard (Cervantes
Merlin in Cervantes’s *Don Quixote*

The figure of Merlin plays a significant role in Part Two of the *Quixote*. Merlin is imagined by Don Quixote in his visit to Montesinos’s cave (pt. 2, ch. 23), and Merlin is materialized with the help of the Duke and Duchess, avid readers of Part One of the novel, in the person of their majordomo (pt. 2, ch. 35), with a follow-up enactment by their page as the “Countess Trifaldi” (pt. 2, chs. 36, 39–41). What has transpired here, as shown by González Echevarría (2015, 260, 264–7, 271–2), is that the Duke and Duchess’s majordomo has concocted the whole thing; the majordomo organized the macabre pageant in the forest, played the role of Merlin, wrote the verses of Merlin’s speech (the majordomo is a poet!), and later played the role of Trifaldín, while the Duke and Duchess’s page has appeared as the Countess Trifaldi. In effect, the majordomo has become one of the “internal authors” of the novel, giving us several layers of fictionality and leading to the most outrageous of Dulcinea’s transformations, not as a garlic-scented peasant girl but as a beautiful transvestite in the person of the page (González Echevarría 2015, 265, 271). Yet the matter is still more complicated: Cervantes has intertwined the ruse of the disenchantment of Dulcinea, which was Sancho’s invention, with the means of her disenchantment, as prescribed by the Duke and Duchess’s “Merlin”, and a “coda” effected by their page, the beautiful “Countess Trifaldi”. And all this is bound up — Sancho, again — with the squire’s novel-long desire to govern some newly conquered isle, which turns out to be — thanks, again, to the Duke and Duchess — the famous island of “Barataria”.

Here is how it happens: Merlin is first mentioned by Don Quixote when he narrates his visit down into the cave of Montesinos (pt. 4, ch. 23); he tells his interlocutors, the scholar who has persuaded him to do so and his squire Sancho, that Montesinos and his cave’s companions have been

---

9. “She seemed to one and all to be too beautiful, and with a masculine ease and a not-very-womanly voice”. My translation of “a todos pareció más que demasiadamente hermoso; y con un desenfado varonil, y con una voz no muy adamada” (Cervantes Saavedra 1738, 4: 24 [pt 2, ch. 35]).
enchanted by Merlin. Merlin is then materialized, in the person of the Duke and Duchess's majordomo; that is, he becomes a principal player in the Duke and Duchess's deception of Don Quixote and Sancho, promising (threatening) the means for the disenchantment of Dulcinea on the back side of Sancho Panza. The Duke and Duchess's majordomo, who has a deeply playful and free-wheeling mind (de muy burlesco y desenf adado ingenio), puts on a horrific costume and announces himself as Merlin, more clever and powerful than the devil himself, and demands that Sancho disenchant Dulcinea by giving himself 3,300 lashes. All this has occurred in an eerie nighttime pageant, illuminated by torches, in the forest. Sancho is disinclined to carry out the task, but the Duke threatens to withhold Sancho's governorship if he does not comply (pt. 2, ch. 35). Then the Duke and Duchess contrive the conceit of the “Countess Tribaldi” (played by their page), whose dishonor has provoked the giant Malambruno to give the countess and all her maidens beards (pt. 2, chs. 36–40). To undo this harm and humiliation, the Duke and Duchess warn, Don Quixote and Sancho must ride into the night sky on a wooden horse called Clavileño; after having done so, they are told that their mission has been accomplished (pt. 2, ch. 41). Sancho is then sent off to his governorship (pt. 2, ch. 42).

The demand made by “Merlin” will remain a threat to Sancho's governorship, he is told, until he endures the whipping that is to result in the disenchantment of Dulcinea. After completing ten days of his governorship of Barataria in an exemplary manner, Sancho renounces his rule and gives a moving farewell speech (pt. 2, chs. 53, 55). Still, Don Quixote insists that Sancho perform the disenchantment exercise (pt. 2, ch. 59). When Don Quixote threatens to give Sancho the required whipping himself, Sancho knocks Don Quixote to the ground and makes him swear that he will not do so (pt. 2, ch. 60). Later, at Don Quixote's urging (pt. 2, chs. 68, 69), Sancho begins, then completes the 3,300 lashes, all but eight or nine of which have been exacted on the barks of beech trees (haya) rather than on Sancho's back (pt. 2, chs. 71, 72). The preparation and execution of the cave of Montesinos adventure, and Don Quixote's belligerent then compassionate approach to Sancho's taking the required Dulcinea-disenchanting lashes—all key episodes in Cervantes's Part Two—are illustrated by the Vanderbank/Van der Gucht engravings (pt. 2, chs.

---

10. Except for the figure of Merlin, of medieval English tradition (Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia regum Britanniae), Montesinos and the others are all drawn from the Carolingian and Arthurian cycles of epics and popular legends (González Echevarría 2015, 242).
22 and 23, and chs. 60 and 71, respectively). Lord Carteret must have had these decisive adventures in mind when, sometime in the period 1718–1721, he suggested the addition of the *Vida y hechos del ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha* to Princess Caroline’s ‘library of the sage Merlin’.

**Lord John Carteret (1690–1763), the “wise connoisseur of Spanish books”**

Lord John Carteret, 2nd Earl Granville was a lifelong member of the House of Lords from the age of his majority in 1711 until his death in 1763 (see Fig. 1, below). Pemberton (1936, frontispiece) estimates Carteret to be about thirty years of age in this Pelham portrait. Within the Whig party Carteret was a member of the Stanhope/Sunderland

---

**Figure 1.** Lord John Carteret, by Peter Pelham, after Sir Godfrey Keller. National Portrait Gallery, London.
faction in opposition to the Walpole/Townshend wing, and he had an early, successful diplomatic career in negotiating a series of peace treaties among Sweden, Denmark, Prussia, and Russia in 1719–1720 (Malek 1975, 11, 12). From 1721 to 1724 Carteret served King George I (r. 1714–1727) as Secretary of State for the Southern District, which consisted of Italy, France, Spain, and its American colonies. Starting in the year of Carteret's appointment, the conduct of foreign affairs was shared by two Secretaries of State. The more important Northern Department consisted of Scandinavia, Russia, Prussia, Hanover, and the Empire; the lesser, Southern Division was awarded to Carteret (Pemberton 1936, 62). Sir Robert Walpole and Lord Charles Townshend forced Carteret to resign his post in 1724, despite Carteret's hope that the good will of the German-speaking King George I, the first monarch of the House of Hanover on the British throne, would suffice to protect him; still, Carteret did not seem to mind; he went home to Bedfordshire, to his wife, his only son and four daughters, finding himself back at the “fireside which he loved so much” (Pemberton 1936, 82, 87).

Carteret was then immediately “exiled”, that is, appointed to the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland, England's restive colonial dependency. Although Walpole thought that this appointment would permanently sideline Carteret, his administration turned out to be “what was probably the most successful administration in eighteenth-century Ireland”: Carteret appointed Irish (rather than English) candidates to several key positions in church and state, instituted financial reforms, and generally made apparent his sympathy for Ireland's independence cause (Malek 1975, 12). After his appointment ended, Carteret attributed his relative success in governing Ireland to a singular fact, “I pleased Dr. Swift,” he wrote in reference to Jonathan Swift, the Dean of St. Patrick's (Pemberton 1936, 105,110). Carteret expressed this sentiment in a letter to Swift on 24 March 1737: “When people ask me how I govern’d Ireland I say yt I pleas’d Dr. Swift. Quaesitam meritis sume superbiam” (quoted by Malek 1975, 15).11

Halfway through his appointment in Ireland, in 1727, however, Carteret had lost the authority to nominate deans, members of the Board of Exchequer, officers in the army or governors of forts without the express approval of the British Secretary of State for the Southern District

11. The motto is from Horace: “Assume the honors that are justly due to your merits” (https://eudict.com/?lang=lateng&word=sume%20superbiam%20qu%C3%A6sitam%20meritis).
Still, Swift admired Carteret’s “learning, compassion, integrity, [and] common sense”, which he registered in “A Vindication of His Excellency Lord Carteret”. Published in Dublin in 1730 on the eve of Carteret’s departure, Swift’s essay was less the vindication of a public official than a tribute to a respected friend (Malek 1975, 15–16). Because they shared as intellectuals a view of humanity’s foibles, Carteret’s public political actions in Ireland were tempered by his cordial personal relationship with Swift. Swift composed a couplet that summed up his feelings for Carteret: “I do the most that friendship can, / I hate the viceroy, love the man” (quoted by Pemberton 1936, 89).

Carteret’s life as a polyglot intellectual is his enduring legacy. He was devoted to the classics but also to the modern languages and literatures; he stood out as one of the only Englishmen of his time who was competent in the German language. (The confidence that this knowledge could inspire explains in part the trust that Carteret enjoyed with the Royal House of Hanover in its early years.) His devotion to the study of Homer was unbounded. The great classical scholar Richard Bentley, Master of Trinity College and Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge University, was a frequent guest at Carteret’s home when visiting London. On one occasion Carteret’s mother, Lady Granville, reproached her son for “keeping the learned divine sitting up till intoxicated”; but what Lady Granville had mistaken for drunken revelry was actually Bentley’s attempt to instruct and entertain Carteret “by reciting ‘Terence’ according to the true Cantilena of the ancients” (Pemberton 1939, 87), that is, by reciting the Roman comedies of Terence in Latin verse meters, sometimes recited, other times chanted or sung.

Lord Carteret’s interest in Spanish literature, specifically Cervantes’s Don Quixote was long-standing. No doubt nurtured during his years (1721–1724) as George I’s Secretary of State for the Southern District, he commissioned, and saw completed, the creation of the first illustration for his Quixote in 1723. This engraving features the would-be knight-errant Alonso Quijano staring fixedly at the armored breastplate, sword, and lance that hang above his fireplace mantel; it is signed: “I. Vanderbank invent et delin — Geo.Vertue Sculpit 1723” (see Fig. 2, below). Unlike many engravings of the metamorphosing Alonso Quijano, which make him look like

12. This was Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1st Duke of Newcastle, who served in that post, following Carteret, from 1724 to 1748.
13. The Tonson publishing house reused the Vanderbank/Van der Gucht engravings in its edition of Charles Jarvis’s English translation of the Quixote
a crazed madman or a fool, Vanderbank and Vertue imagine him to be a little like the rest of us as when, in deep concentration, we contemplate making significant changes in our lives.

In 1726 the Spanish lexicographer Pedro Pineda dedicated his Spanish grammar book to the English polyglot. 14 During the second half of the 1720s, Carteret commissioned the full complement of the illustrations’

(London, 1742). I reproduce here the engraving from that imprint because of its unavailability in the New York Public Library’s imprint of 1738.

14. Titled Corta y compendiosa arte para aprender a hablar, leer y escribir la lengua Española/A Short and Compendious Method for the Learning to Speak, Read, and Write the Spanish Language, Pineda’s grammar book was published in London by T. Woodward.
designs for his 1738 edition of the Quixote. Had an exchange with Princess Caroline provided him with an immediately motivating stimulus or incentive? Quite possibly so, because of her broad intellectual and literary interests and their shared regard for fictional literature and its manifold potential for the interpretation of human experience. This would include, in Caroline’s case, as we will see later, the usefulness of folklore and fiction in mythologizing history.

Caroline of Brandenburg-Ansbach (1683–1737): Princess of Wales, Queen Consort of Great Britain and Ireland

Born in 1683 in Ansbach in the Principality of Ansbach in the Holy Roman Empire, Caroline lost her parents in 1694 and 1696, at her respective ages of eleven and thirteen; the Elector and Electress of Brandenburg, Frederick I and Sophie Charlotte (afterwards, first King and Queen of Prussia), were appointed as her guardians. Although the Brandenburg Court was in Berlin, Caroline spent most of her time with Sophia Charlotte, “who lived a mostly estranged existence from her husband at Lutzenburg (later renamed Charlottenburg), the Italianate residence outside the city which he completed for her in 1696” (Hanham 2004, 278–79). This site offered Caroline “a stimulating environment for a princess with little formal education but with an avid interest in the arts, a love of music and theatre, and whose developing mind was attracted to new ideas and new thinking, particularly in the topical questions of philosophy and theology” (Hanham 2004, 279). Caroline's guardian's lively mind was fond of “dispatching theological monsters, setting the Jesuit against the Huguenot, the priestly controversialist against the sceptic”; it was she who introduced Caroline to the German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz (1646–1716) (Quennell 1940, 5, 6). It was reported that when the Electress-cum-Queen of Prussia Sophie Charlotte was on her deathbed, she politely declined the services of the French chaplain at Hanover because, “as the Queen remarked, she had devoted twenty years of study to religious

15. The Electress Sophie Charlotte was the daughter of the Electress Sophia of Hanover and the sister to the future George I of England; thus, when Caroline married George Louis’s son, George Augustus, the Electress Sophie Charlotte became Caroline's aunt by marriage.
questions, and he could tell her nothing that she did not already know” (Quennell 1940, 7).

Caroline’s qualities of mind and character outfitted her for a royal marriage of great importance. She had turned down the marriage proposal of the Archduke Charles, heir to the Holy Roman Empire, perhaps out of distaste for converting to Catholicism, but after George Augustus (1683–1760), the Electoral Prince of Hanover, disguised himself as an ordinary Hanoverian nobleman and visited her, later revealing his identity, she married him on 2 September 1705 (Quennell 1940, 8–9). George and Caroline were 22 years old. At the age of 31 in 1714, George Augustus and Caroline arrived in England with the titles of Prince and Princess of Wales; they were thus able to prepare, over the course of a thirteen-year period, for their eventual roles as King and Queen Consort of Great Britain and Ireland, when they would also become lifetime holders of the titles of Elector and Electress Consort of Hanover.

Unlike her husband George Augustus, who took no interest in learning the English language (hence his father, King George I, relied on the German-speaking Lord John Carteret in matters of statecraft), Caroline threw herself into the English language and aristocratic English society. Although she apparently retained a heavy guttural German accent in English (Quennell 1940, 16), she was well regarded, and her relationships with English artists and intellectuals were a staple of her life in England. Her portrait was painted early, in 1716 by Sir Godfrey Kneller, the dean of English artists, then in 1727 by one of his students, the Irish-born Charles Jarvis, and in 1736, by the artist John Vanderbank who, in the 1720s had created the designs for the copper engravings that graced the Carteret Quixote of 1738.17

In London, Caroline’s love of learning, her interest in the arts and patronage of artists were acknowledged early and late (Arkell 1939, 16. This outcome may have not been so likely without the efforts of the Electress Sophie Charlotte and the offices of her mother, the dowager Electress Sophia, who survived her, smoothing the way (Hanham 2004, 281, 283).

17. Charles Jarvis later became the English-language translator of the Quixote that would be published in London in 1742; it included the sixty-eight illustrations designed by Vanderbank and engraved by Gerard Van der Gucht. Jarvis’s translation was published steadily throughout the eighteenth century and through the first half of the nineteenth in London; from then until the end of the nineteenth and through the early twentieth century, it was also published in the United States (Rudder, comp. and ed. 1975, 138–39). This amounted to some eighty editions with an additional, untold number of reprints.
240–46). In 1717 Jacob Tonson the Elder published an English translation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses in Fifteen Books* that featured as its frontispiece an engraving, based on the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller, of “Her Royal Highness, the Princess of Wales” (see Fig. 3, below). However hyperbolic as such tributes tended to be, Samuel Garth's dedication of the volume to her serves as an index of the regard in which Caroline was held in the earliest years of her time in England, starting with her intellectual interests: “Since

![Image of Caroline of Brandenburg-Ansbach, here “Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales”, after the portrait of 1716 by Sir Godfrey Kneller. The engraving is signed: “G Kneller Eques Baron *p*inxit — Geo Vertue *sculpsit*”. In Ovid 1717, frontispiece. New York Public Library.](image)

18. Its engraver, George Vertue, would later engrave the invented portrait of Cervantes that appears in the Carteret edition of the *Quixote*.
I am allow’d the honour, and Privilege of so easy Access to Your Royal Highness, I dare say I shall not be the worse received for bringing Ovid along with me” (Garth 1717, Aii). She knew, he continued, “the politer languages of the present age like a native” and, like an historian, she was acquainted with the great “occurrences and periods of the past”; her moral virtues were such that she was at ease in putting aside grandeur on informal occasions while taking it up when the dignity of her station required, and she never flaunted her intellectual superiority but rather always observed the modesty that was the “province of her sex” (Garth 1717, Aiiir).

Also noteworthy was the medals struck in 1736 to honor Queen Consort Caroline and King George II. Created for a commercial purpose, these small silver medals were given to purchasers of lottery tickets who wagered on winning the sixty-gallon wine cistern, created from 8,000 ounces of silver, that the London goldsmith and banker Henry Jernegan had created on commission for a buyer who backed out of the purchase (Turner 2022 https://www.pcgs.com/news/jernegans-silver-lottery-medal). On the obverse King George II is represented by the Roman goddess Minerva, with war trophies and emblems of the arts and sciences at her feet. Its encircling motto is “Both hands fill’d for Britain — George reigning — 1736”. The reverse features Caroline portrayed as herself and clad in royal robes while watering young palm trees; the encircling motto proclaims: “Growing arts adorn empire — Caroline protecting — 1736”. In short, from Princess of Wales to Queen Consort, Caroline exercised and developed the interests that stand as her significant legacy. She has been called “the ablest and most powerful of all Queens Consort” (Hichens 2006, 19).

According to Hanham, when her husband George Augustus acceded to the British throne in 1727, Caroline’s public personality and royal ‘style’ were already firmly established; her close personal relationship with her husband, and the way they “jointly fashioned their ‘image’ at Court were fundamental to the unique contribution she made to establishing and ‘anglicising’ the [Hanoverian] dynasty after 1714” (2004, 276). Her intellectual and cultural interests ranged broadly, and they included the creation of her own collections of paintings and books and manuscripts, her interest in garden design, her communication with the literary and intellectual lights of her day, and her excursions to the residences and work sites of other notables, including the Greenwich Observatory of the Astronomer-Royal Edmund Halley (1656–1742 [OS 1741) and the repository of the scientific collections of Sir Hans Sloane (1660–1753) (HANHAM 2004, 295; see also Quennell 1940, 230–2).
The Making of the London Edition of the Quixote, 1720s–1738

To create an edition of the Quixote that would be “fit for a princess” — or, more certainly, that would meet Lord Carteret’s exacting standards — no cost or effort was spared. The prestigious publishing house of Tonson was contracted. Under Jacob the Elder’s guidance, its English translation of Ovid’s Metamorphoses, as noted, had been dedicated to Princess Caroline in 1717. In 1718 the founder effectively retired, and the founder’s heirs Jacob and Richard Tonson undertook Carteret’s original-language project.19 This was not unexpected; the Tonson dynasty produced three other major editions of foreign works in the original language, a Racine (1723), Tasso’s Gerusalemme Liberata (1724), and Plutarch’s Lives in Greek and Latin (1724–1729): “All three were finely printed, illustrated luxury editions in the same format as the eventual Don Quixote, and the highly popular masterpiece of Spanish literature fitted perfectly into this programme” (Hammelmann 1969, 5).

Assuring the accuracy of the prose text of the novel was paramount. For this purpose, Lord Carteret charged the Spanish lexicographer Pedro Pineda (c. 1700–c. 1762) to take on the task. They were well known to each other. As mentioned, in 1726 Pineda, “teacher of the Spanish tongue in London”, as announced on the title page of his bilingual grammar of the Spanish language, had dedicated the work to “Lord Carteret, Baron Hawes, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland” (Dowling 1985, 6).20 Of Sephardic origin, Pineda lived in London from early in his life until his death in the early 1760s. He taught the Spanish language to members of the English nobility, and his Spanish grammar was intended to provide his students (muchos caballeros y damas) with a manual to replace earlier grammatical accounts whose explanations he found to be “in some places too succinct, in others too obscure” (Pineda 1726, A2). Pineda’s most important contribution to Spanish studies in Great Britain has been identified as his bilingual

---

20. Pineda’s dedication states: “I am not ignorant, my Lord, that the common theme of all dedications is the virtues of the noblemen to whom they are addressed; but I decline a task that is altogether useless, since your Excellency’s [virtues] are too bright not to be known to every subject of the nation which has the honour to boast your birth” (Pineda 1726, A2).
Spanish-English dictionary, *Nuevo diccionario español e inglés/A New Dictionary, English and Spanish*, which was published in London in 1740 with a second edition in 1750 (Dowling 1985, 8). Pineda himself, however, registered great pride in preparing the Spanish text of Carteret’s *Quixote*. On the title page of his edition of *Los diez libros de fortuna de amor* (1573) by Antonio de Lo Frasso (London, 1740), Pineda announced that he had “reviewed, revised, put in good order, and corrected the edition of *Don Quixote* published by J. Tonson”.21 Later preparing a new, abbreviated edition of the textbook of the Spanish language that he had inscribed to Lord Carteret in 1726, he dedicated the revised version to the five children of Queen Consort Caroline and King George II, announcing the purpose of this *Short and Easy Introduction to the Rudiments of the Spanish Tongue* (London, 1750) “to entertain the most serene young princes as well as those who wish to renounce idleness and melancholy” (quoted by Dowling 1985, 7).

Perhaps the greater challenge in producing the London *Quixote* was to create an abundant series of visual representations that could augment the prose text, making it more attractive — if not also more intelligible — to readers in Great Britain, perhaps starting with the German princess Caroline, who is not known to have read Spanish. This task would fall to English, not Spanish, artists. As mentioned earlier, the first engraving that Lord Carteret commissioned for the edition was produced by John Vanderbank (1694–1739) and George Vertue (1684–1756) in 1723, and it portrays Alonso Quijano, who abandons his reading to fix his gaze at the ancestral armor mounted on the wall, imagining his transformation into a knight-errant.22 This is the first engraving in the Carteret edition proper, and, as noted on the engraving itself, it appears on “Vol. 1, p. 1” (see Fig. 2, 217). The date of 1723 is also found on two of John Vanderbank’s related preliminary drawings (Hammelmann 1975, 81).

21. My translation. On the same title page of 1740, Pineda registered the sum of his literary editorial and linguistic achievements to that date. In addition to his preparation of the *Quixote* text, these consisted of his edition of Gaspar Gil Polo’s *Diana enamorada*, which was a sequel to Jorge de Montemayor’s pastoral novel, and his Spanish grammar as well as his Spanish-English dictionary: “[H]a revisto, enmendado, puesto en buen orden, y corregido a *Don Quixote*, impresso por J. Tonson, a la *Diana enamorada* de Gil Polo, pues es el mismo que publicó una Gramática por la Lengua Española, y un Diccionario por el mismo efecto” (Pineda, ed., title page).

22. For a brilliant interpretation of the notion of literary protagonists’ transformations in Cervantes’s novel, see González Echevarría 2022.
Although the *Quixote* occupied Vanderbank “for the greater part of his short working life”, it is likely that the English artist received the “definitive” commission no earlier than 1726; all told, Vanderbank created some four sets of drawings: the preliminary set, not used, dates from 1726 to 1729, notated *invenit*, is preserved in the British Museum, and the third, finished set is housed at the J. Pierpont Morgan Library in Manhattan; all the drawings of this finished set are dated in Vanderbank’s hand with the notation *fecit* and the year “1729” (Hammelmann 1969, 3, 4–5).23 As acknowledged by Carteret in a letter to Sir Benjamin Keene, the British ambassador to Spain, Carteret’s friend, Dr. John Oldfield, had “invented most” of the designs and instructed Vanderbank on their desired content (Paulson 1998, 48, 206n45).

There was nothing in Vanderbank’s previous work that would have prepared him to illustrate Cervantes’s masterpiece. And it seems that Carteret, as editor, had approached both Vanderbank and William Hogarth for the task. Hogarth produced a half dozen or so illustrations from the earliest chapters of the *Quixote*, but only two of them have been located, both at Windsor Castle; Hammelmann suggests that there is no reason to doubt that “Hogarth’s performance ‘gave so little satisfaction to his noble employer that they were paid for and laid aside in favor of Vanderbank’s drawings’” (1969, 6). The engravings prepared on the basis of Vanderbank’s drawings were created by Gerard Van der Gucht (1697–1776), and this included the work’s allegorical frontispiece.24 The notable exception is the invented portrait of Cervantes, “Retrato de Cervantes de Saavedra por él mismo”, that was designed and drawn by William Kent (1685–1748) and engraved by George Vertue.25

An unusual aspect of the 1738 edition is the contribution by Dr. John Oldfield, a friend of Carteret’s who provided an essay, translated into Spanish by Gregorio Mayáns y Síscar, “Advertencias de D. Juan Oldfield, Dotor en Medicina, Sobre las Estampas desta Historia”. This essay elevates

---

23. In addition, Vanderbank produced “at least two different series of paintings on small panels all depicting, as far as one can judge from the samples that have so far come to light, exactly the same scenes” (Hammelmann 1969, 3).
24. Hammelmann (1969, 10) describes the engravings as being done in the “heavy style” of the period and suggests, therefore, that the best measure of Vanderbank’s achievements are his original drawings.
25. Kent designed this portrait on the basis of Cervantes’s description of himself found near the beginning of his prologue to *Novelas ejemplares* (1613). Mayáns y Síscar (in Cervantes Saavedra 1738, 1: 102–103) transcribes that description.
the practice of book illustration, in Hammelmann’s words, “from an auxiliary to an equal, supplementary art”, thus testifying to the demanding criteria that the Quixote of 1738 was expected to meet (1969, 6–7). Oldfield’s essay is not novel insofar as it emphasizes “the features and gestures of the persons concerned”: the artist, as Oldfield points out, can make visible “how the [subject’s] countenance and outward deportment are influenced by the inward movements of the mind” and thus make up for any deficiency in the author’s description or any lack in the reader’s imagination ([1737] 1742, 1: xxv). Oldfield’s innovation, however, was to suggest that the choice of subjects should be based on their “fitness” for visual illustration rather than their “general importance in respect to the matter of the treatise, or any other consideration” ([1737] 1742, 1: xxv).²⁶

In this light, Oldfield criticizes the Quixote engravings based on the paintings of Charles-Antoine Coypel (1694–1752) as being too crude.²⁷ He argues that the visual representation of Don Quixote attacking the windmills and assailing the flocks of sheep, “when set before the eye, become too shocking for the belief”, denying all verisimilitude and therefore credibility. Doing so, he contends, gives “a kind of ocular demonstration of the falsity of them”, thus destroying their “very being” (Oldfield [1737] 1742, 1: xxvi; see also Paulson 1998, 48). Oldfield explains his strategy best by an example: He ordered Vanderbank’s dual representation (“as we have ordered the matter in the print”) of Don Quixote’s explanation of the enchantment of Dulcinea in Montesinos’s cave. In that episode, Don Quixote’s interlocutors are Sancho Panza, who had invented the tale of Dulcinea’s transformation in the first place, and a “famous student” (famoso estudiante),²⁸ who has served as Don Quijote’s advisor on how to enter Montesinos’s cave (Cervantes Saavedra [1605, 1615] 1738, 3, 218

²⁶. I cite here Oldfield’s original English-language text, which appears alongside Jarvis’s English translation of the Quixote (London: Tonson, 1742). It is titled “Advertisement concerning the Prints” (Oldfield 1742, 1: xxv–xxxii).

²⁷. Coypel created a series of twenty-five compositions between 1715 and 1734 that were woven as tapestries before later serving as the source, between 1723 and 1736, for a series of engravings that reproduced them (Lenaghan 2003, 150). Those engravings appeared in the Quixote edition of 1744, published in The Hague.

²⁸. Cervantes never fails to poke fun at these pedantic, bookish types, and I use the term “scholar” in that vein. A licenciado identifies someone with a university degree but might better be thought of here as a “schooled pedant”.


Cervantes titled this chapter: “On the incredible things that Don Quixote told that he had seen in the cave of Montesinos, the impossibility and grandeur of which suggest that this adventure should be understood to be apocryphal”. Under Oldfield’s instructions, Vanderbank...
created not one but two drawings for Don Quixote’s adventure in the cave of Montesinos. We begin with the second, which is the one that Oldfield discusses in his “Advertisement concerning the Prints”. Oldfield had Vanderbank create a two-tiered drawing (see Fig. 4, below):

In the upper half of the engraving, Don Quixote explains to Sancho Panza and the scholar, author of books, whose learning “knew no limits”, the marvels that he has seen in Montesino’s cave — and this includes his vision of the enchanted Dulcinea. Vanderbank’s creation of the three interlocutors’ facial expressions makes the point: Don Quixote’s earnestness on reporting what he believes he has seen; the scholar’s gullible belief in the account — his “solemn stupidity,” as Oldfield (CERVANTES SAAVEDRA [1605, 1615] 1742, 1: xxvii) described it — and Sancho Panza’s dismay, not knowing whether to laugh or weep.31 In the lower right corner of the drawing shadowy figures (Montesinos, Belerma and Durandarte and others unnamed, who came from the tales of Charlemagne and, in Spain, from the narrative ballads called romances) have all been transformed by “the wise Merlin” (el sabio Merlín). Vanderbank portrays the encounter in the cave, with Don Quixote, bound by the rope that has lowered him into the pit, looking on.32

The inclusion of a preliminary drawing, however, expands and enriches the story. This is the account of Don Quixote and Sancho’s propitious meeting with that scholar, “a famous student, fond of books of chivalry, who would gladly take him to Montesinos’s cave”, who proclaimed himself a “humanist”.33 The said scholar advises Don Quixote to lower himself into the marvelous cave of Montesinos. Sancho thinks this plan is crazy, and

31. I cite Jarvis’s translation: “When Sancho heard his master say all this, he was ready to run distracted, or to die with laughing; for, as he knew the truth of the feigned enchantment of Dulcinea, of whom he himself had been the enchanter, and the bearer of that testimony, he concluded undoubtedly that his master had lost his senses, and was in all points mad” (CERVANTES SAAVEDRA [1605, 1615] 1742, 2: 122 [pt. 2, ch. 23]).
32. For this ingenious, narratively sequential composition, Oldfield (CERVANTES SAAVEDRA [1605, 1615] 1742, 1: xxvii) acknowledged as precedent Raphael’s “Pharaoh’s Dream” and Rembrandt’s print of a “Fortune Teller”.
33. Cervantes here considers the term “humanist” in negative terms, a value which it may have taken in his day. It pertained to the learned, philological endeavors that had begun in the fifteenth century with Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457), his peers and successors, who examined textual and philological evidence, rather than relying on inherited traditions of antique authority, to determine historical reliability. In this way, Valla had revealed the falsity of the so-called “Donation
he is alarmed by the danger to Don Quixote of lowering himself into the
cave. But after he has helped the scholar bind Don Quixote with a rope
about the chest, he admonishes his master (Jarvis translates): “Have a care,
dear Sir, what you do: do not bury yourself alive, nor hang yourself dangling
like a flask of wine let down to cool in a well; for it is no business of your
worship’s, nor does it belong to you, to be the scrutinizer of this hole, which
must needs be worse than any dungeon” (CERVANTES SAAVEDRA [1605,
1615] 1738, 3, 204; CERVANTES SAAVEDRA [1605, 1615] 1742, 2: 115 [pt. 2,
chap. 22]). This is precisely the moment that Vanderbank portrays, with
Sancho’s worried face captured in profile, while Don Quixote listens to him

![Figure 5. Sancho implores Don Quixote, who already has the rope tied around
his chest, to desist from his plan to be lowered into Montesinos’s cave. Looking
on are the pedantic young men who have encouraged him to do so. In CERVANTES
SAAVEDRA [1605, 1615] 1738, 3: 204. New York Public Library.](image)

of Constantine”, that is, the Roman emperor Constantine’s supposed transfer of
authority over Rome and the western part of the Roman Empire to the Pope.
intently, and the scholar-guide (famoso estudiante) looks on, hoping that Sancho will just shut up (see Fig. 5, above).

At the right side of the pictorial frame stands his cousin, rope in hand, who introduced Don Quixote to the scholar-guide; his presence increases the sense of foreboding that Sancho registers. This is not a “burlesque”: the engraving reveals the human drama of Cervantes’s novel, which conveys the deep humanity that binds man and master. Sancho may have invented Dulcinea’s “enchantment” to get himself out of a jam, but he is not indifferent to the physical peril that Don Quixote now (and quite frequently) faces. Nor is Sancho immune to his own feelings — both disinterested and self-interested — for Don Quixote. This engraving is a masterstroke that reveals Don Quixote’s earnestness and, simultaneously, Sancho’s repentance for having been his master’s deceitful “enchanter” (but not about to admit it, due to his self-interest) and his genuine concern for Don Quixote’s safety and wellbeing (the disinterested part), all of which is compounded by his feelings of guilt. This engraving exemplifies, in my view, the vision of Carteret as conceived, ordered, designed, and executed by the Carteret-Oldfield-Vanderbank-Van der Gucht team.

Why the ten-year hiatus between the completion of the illustrations and the publication of the work? It was at least in part due to Carteret’s interest in including an originally researched, authoritative account of Cervantes’s life. Gregorio Mayáns y Síscar was the person for the task but, as Philip V’s royal librarian, he was forced to research and write his Vida de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra while engaged in his more pressing royal labors. Mayáns’s Vida reached Carteret in London on 18 February 1737 (Hammelmann 1969, 12). Soon afterward, Carteret asked Mayáns to translate into Spanish John Oldfield’s essay on the illustrations, and Mayáns delivered it on 24 August 1737, the same date that a full set of the four volumes’ engravings was dispatched from London to Madrid (Hammelmann 1969, 12).

The relationship between Carteret and Mayáns was another of the important drivers of this Quixote (not to say quixotic) project, and the mutual recognition of their respective statures as intellectuals is apparent in the confidence that Carteret placed in Mayáns and, in turn, in Mayáns’s recognition of the significant value that this London edition had for the broader literary reputation of Cervantes’s masterwork. Mayáns paid his tribute to Carteret the previous year in his independent publication of the Vida de Miguel de Cervantes (Madrid, 1737) and he reiterated it in the London edition of 1738. (I quote John Ozell’s translation [Cervantes Saavedra (1605, 1615) 1742, 1: A2v] and transcribe the original Spanish text in the note):
[Y]ou have manifested yourself as the most liberal Maintainer and Propagator of his Memory; And it is by YOUR LORDSHIP and through Your Means, that Cervantes and his Ingenious Gentleman do Now acquire their due Estimation and their greatest Value. Once again therefore let the Great Don Quixote de la Mancha sally forth to the Light, hitherto an unfortunate Adventurer, but Now and forever a most Happy One under Your Lordship’s auspicious Patronage.34

Mayáns’s enthusiastic pronouncement was prescient, as we will soon see. Subscriptions for Carteret’s completed edition were put on offer in February 1738, and the London publication of the four-volume *Quixote* in Spanish was announced in the *Daily Gazetteer* on 28 April 1738 (Hammelmann 1969, 12, 15n31).

Carteret summed up his decade-plus efforts in a letter to Ambassador Keene: “I hope you will think the edition is tolerable upon the whole”, and he adds, in recommending the result, “I know none in which one can read it in so good a letter, which is what I intended, and if they value the book as it is said they do in Spain, let them print it either at the expense of the Court or Academy with the magnificence of the Louvre, and employ the best masters in Italy to invent prints upon new subjects” (quoted by Hammelmann 1969, 12) But, alas! If Caroline had provided an immediately motivating impetus for Carteret’s creation of this great edition, she was now gone. Queen Caroline had died half a year earlier, on 20 November 1737. In any case, during her later years she had turned against her learned friend Lord Carteret, due to the machinations of Sir Roberto Walpole and his triumphant faction of the Whig party. In fact, “politics [apparently] alienated from the Court all the eminent men of letters because Walpole, sharing George II’s contempt for them, denied them patronage or employment” (Arkell 1939, 232–33). Caroline herself was cited on that point, the source being Lord John Hervey’s memoir, in which she is said to have called Carteret in 1733 one of “two of the

34. Ozell follows closely Mayáns’s ([1737] 1738a, 1: A2v) original Spanish-language text, which describes Carteret’s admiration for Cervantes’s *Quixote*: “U[nuestra] E[xcelencia] le tiene tan justo de sus Obras, que ha manifestado ser el más liberal mantenedor, i propagador de su memoria; i es [usted] por quien Cervantes, i su Ingenioso Hidalgo logran hoi el mayor aprecio y estimación. Salga pues nuevamente a la luz del Mundo el Gran Don Quixote de la Mancha, si hasta hoi Caballero desgraciadamente aventurero, en adelante, por U. E. felizmente Venturoso".
greatest liars and knaves in any country” (Ballantyne 1887: 164–167; Pemberton 1936, 132, 339n79). Given Carteret’s general disposition, such an insult was unlikely to have phased him, even if he had known about it. As Carteret well knew, the politics of the royal court were no less arbitrary or self-interested than those of Parliament: When Carteret lost, “as in the circumstances he was bound to lose, he took his defeats with the semi-amused, semi-contemptuous indifference of a man of the world” (Pemberton 1936, 88).

On 25 March 1738 Lord Carteret signed his dedication of the now-completed London edition to the Countess of Montijo, Doña María Fernández de Córdoba y Portocarrero (1693–1747), whose husband, the fifth Count of Montijo, Don Cristóbal Gregorio Portocarrero y Funes de Villalpando, had served Philip V as ambassador to Great Britain from 1732 to 1735. This dedication is worth noting, not because of its formal conventionality but because it plausibly sums up Carteret’s decade-plus effort to bring his unprecedented edition of the Quixote into being. I paraphrase it here, because of its value for the emerging awareness of Cervantes’s masterwork in the eighteenth century, when it was first understood to be something much greater than a ‘picaresque novel’, a moniker that to this day sometimes weighs down the novel’s heft and underestimates its significance.

I summarize here Carteret’s dedication text (Cervantes Saavedra [1605, 1615] 1738, 1, i–iv): He begins by telling the countess that if this edition had been completed before she left London to return to Spain, he would not have presented it to her publicly in this manner without first having obtained her permission. But even without it, he judged it “not inappropriate” to dedicate the work to her because, being of superior talents herself, she obviously recognized the universal value of Cervantes’s novel. He pointed out that, when first published, the Quixote had been directed exclusively to the highest nobility of Spain, being uncertain about its acceptance in the wider world. But now, one hundred and thirty

35. Lord Hervey was John Hervey, 2nd Baron Hervey (1696–1743), whose memoir of the early reign of George II (1727–1737) was prohibited from publication by the manuscript’s private owner until after the death of George II’s successor, King George III; it appeared in print for the first time in 1884 (“John Hervey, Baron Hervey” https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Hervey-Baron-Hervey-of-Ickworth). Hervey was a frequent visitor at Richmond when the Prince and Princess of Wales were in residence and also during their reign, when he served as vice chamberlain of the royal household from 1730 to 1740 (Arkell 1939, 175).
years later, the novel's esteem has been recognized not only in Spain but throughout Europe. Thus, he hoped that Her Excellency would not disdain this new edition but rather forgive its deficiencies for having been published in a foreign country in which the creators of its illustrations were not well versed in matters of Spanish dress and custom of Cervantes's period. He adds that Oldfield's essay on the visual renderings was meant not to defend the Vanderbank/Van der Gucht engravings, but rather to show how difficult the task had been to give Cervantes's vision its due. And if today's books of entertainment were to be augmented by adornments to please the eye, then he hoped that Oldfield's essay had offered useful criteria as to how to cast them.36

Carteret added that the account of Cervantes's life, which had been conscientiously researched and written by one of her country's finest authors, Don Gregorio Mayáns y Síscar, was now being for the first time published.37 Carteret assured the countess that Mayáns's account, worthy of the highest praise, would be highly valued, but that, in any case, there was nothing more entertaining than the well-written life of a celebrated author. Carteret reminded the countess that, because Cervantes's fame was already well established, his readers were increasingly interested in knowing about the events of his life. Although Cervantes had been a soldier, wounded in a glorious action,38 the powerful men of his time had shamelessly ignored his brave service and abandoned him to live in poverty. Nevertheless, Carteret insisted, thanks precisely to the knowledge of the circumstances of Cervantes's life, his fame had not diminished, but rather increased. In fact, Carteret concludes, without seeking recourse to "Cervantes's inimitable art of irony", one could say that an unfortunate old soldier, physically impaired and occasionally jailed, had a greater effect on Spain than its expulsion of the Moors, and that, unlike those two famous expulsions, Cervantes had accomplished his mission without the loss of blood, the ruin of families or any other egregious harm or consequence.39

36. With this last statement Carteret appealed to Oldfield's criterion of choosing matters that were appropriate for visual representation rather than those that portrayed narrative events that strained verisimilitude and denied credibility.
37. As mentioned earlier, Mayáns had published the Vida independently in Madrid the previous year, in 1737.
38. This was the decisive victory of Spain and its Catholic allies over the Ottoman Turk in the Battle of Lepanto in the Gulf of Patras in the Ionian Sea in 1571.
39. Carteret refers to the edicts of 1609 and 1614 that expelled the Muslims from Spain. "Famous": Carteret seems to be categorical where Cervantes was not: Sancho Panza expresses sympathy for his old friend Ricote the morisco (former
Only Cervantes, Carteret assures the countess, was capable of rooting out fantastic and extravagant ideas that had infected the values of moral courage and civil conduct. And if in truth it can be said that the one who improves the character (genio) of a nation, giving it the splendor that is its due, does more good for that kingdom that he who extends its boundaries, then Cervantes will be recognized as one of those inestimable figures whose name will live as long as humane letters exist in the world. For by the fertility of his immortal genius, he had produced (notwithstanding that it was done through humor) the most profound, valuable, and salutary effects that could be imagined. Carteret concludes by asking the countess’s pardon for taking the liberty of placing this new edition before her and under her protection, assuring her that it had not been done to flatter her. He adds: “Your Excellency has been universally admired in this country during the time that you resided here as its ambassador because, by honoring your own royal court and country as much as you have honored ours”, you gave to us in Great Britain a magnificent example to follow (Cervantes Saavedra [1605, 1615] 1738, 1, iv).

Carteret’s dedicatory epistle registers his estimation of Cervantes’s literary genius and in doing so reveals the source of the energies that he and his collaborators poured into making this landmark edition. It was an unlikely assemblage: an aristocratic, learned English polyglot and Hispanophile, English artists and engravers, a Spanish historian in Madrid, and a Spanish lexicographer living in London. When the edition was completed, Carteret acknowledged its costliness in a letter to Sir Benjamin Keene of 20 April 1738, about a week before the sale of the book was announced in the Daily Gazetteer. He assured Keene that, as Tonson had “a great estate”, the publisher could afford to “undertake expensive work, and run the hazard of the sale, which no other publisher would have done”; Carteret’s personal financial investment was something above £1200 sterling, and the costs of typesetting the text and engraving Vanderbank’s designs were presumably included in that amount (Hammelmann 1975, 81).

Muslim, now converted to Christianity and called “New Christian”), but tells him that he cannot protect him from the power of the state (Cervantes Saavedra [1605, 1616] 1738, 4: 189–98 [pt. 2, ch. 54]); later, Ricote’s daughter, a Christian, is slated to marry a wealthy young Spaniard (an “Old Christian”), but Cervantes leaves this proposed marriage — this proposed reconciliation of Old and New Christians — in suspense (Cervantes Saavedra [1605, 1616] 1738, 4: 280–91 [pt. 2, ch. 63]).
The legacy of Carteret’s London edition of the *Quixote*

The importance and prestige of the London *Quixote* of 1738 were immediately felt, and its greatest impact resulted in the creation of Spain’s Royal Academy edition of 1780. In its prologue, the Spanish Royal Academy acknowledged that “the costly and magnificent edition published in London by J. and R. Tonson in 1738 in four volumes in quarto (*quarto real*), on the basis of which another was produced, in octavo, in the Hague in 1744, are the ones that, to date, have been prepared with greater care and accuracy than any others” (Cervantes de Saavedra [1605, 1615] 1780, 1: Aijii). The Academy’s prologue of 1780 notes two or three errors of transcription of the London edition that obscured the sense of the utterances or rendered them nonsensical. Yet it adds that such was to be expected in a country in which Spanish was not spoken natively; those errors were excusable abroad but should never be tolerated at home in Spain, where previous editions had been marred by similar and even much graver errors (Cervantes de Saavedra [1605, 1615] 1780 1: Aijiv–v). The Academy emphasized that its edition subscribed to the highest standards of material production and that its adornments were all produced in Spain by Spanish artisans (Cervantes de Saavedra [1605, 1615] 1780 1:Aijvii). The result was “one of the most beautiful books in the history of printing” (Blas and Matilla 2003, 77), that also points out the conflicting interests of the Academy edition’s creators: On one hand, the difference of interest between the Academician Vicente de los Ríos, who contributed the account of Cervantes’s life (which by law gave him the right of co-authorship to the reissued work) and the Academy at large and, on the other, the difference of criteria between the Academy as editor and the professional printer (the house of Joaquín Ibarra), including the many conditions imposed on Ibarra by the Academy (Blas and Matilla 2003, 76–77).

The Royal Academy’s edition produced thirty-three plates, two of which are frontispieces, and employed seven artist-designers and nine engravers. One area of illustration in which the Spanish edition clearly excelled and topped the London edition was in the fidelity of the representation of

40. For the edition’s detailed bibliographic description, see Ashbee 1895, 33–36.
41. My translation. The Hague edition of 1744 contains 24 engravings that were designed by Charles-Antoine Coypel which, as we have seen, were criticized by Oldfield. In the 1744 edition they are reversed from their earlier, undated publication in Paris; Mayáns y Siscar’s *Vida de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra* was also reproduced (Ashbee 1895, 11–12, 21).
costume and armaments to those used in Spain in the seventeenth century. For dress, period Spanish paintings and portraits had been consulted, and for armaments, the Spanish Royal Armory provided sources. The illustration of Don Quixote and Sancho’s first sally forth (Don Quixote’s second departure), drawn by Joseph del Castillo and engraved by Fernando Selma, offers a particularly pleasing example.42

In the early nineteenth century, Spanish accolades were again offered to the London edition of 1738. In his Vida de Miguel Cervantes Saavedra (1819, 204, 205), Martín Fernández de Navarrete (1765–1844) acknowledged once more the importance of the London edition in having been the first to exhibit an “enviable luxury and magnificence”, and he did not shy away from recognizing the essential role that England had played in recognizing the merit of the Quixote: “Thus it was the effort and stimulus provided by a foreign nation that awakened in us at that time the recognition and esteem that the ingenious author of the Quixote enjoyed, as well as the merit of his immortal work, which was spreading throughout all of Europe”.43 For that reason, Navarrete continued, it had been incumbent upon Spain, where Don Quixote was created, not only to acknowledge the foreign editorial achievement as an honor but also as a motivation to enter into a “noble competition” (1819, 205) with it. With that stimulus, the Spanish Royal Academy requested in 1773 the royal authorization to publish the Quixote anew “for the literary glory of the Nation”; the License to Print was signed on 6 November 1780.

Caroline and Her “Merlin’s Cave” at Richmond

When might Lord Carteret and the Hanoverian Caroline, Princess of Wales, have had their congenial meeting of literary minds? We must rule out the suggestion that it occurred during Caroline’s reign as Queen Consort of Great Britain because of the material evidence that, as we have seen, denies

42. For the appreciation of this fine edition, see Blas and Matilla 2003, 73–118.

Although Ashbee (1895, 35) judged the illustrations’ designs to be stiff and conventional, “without power, grace, or movement”, adding “nor is the engraving, as a rule, good”, he welcomed their fidelity in matters of costume and armaments.

43. My translation. “Así fue como el empeño y estímulo de una nación extranjera despertó entre nosotros en aquel tiempo el recuerdo y la estimación hacia el ingenioso autor del QUIXOTE, divulgando por toda la Europa el mérito de aquella obra inmortal” (Navarrete 1819, 205).
that possibility and thus points to a meeting at an earlier time. This would have been during thirteen-year period between 1714 and 1727, when she and her husband were Prince and Princess of Wales and, most likely within that time frame, between 1718, when the Walese’s acquired Richmond Lodge (Arkell 1939, 111–12), and 1724, when Lord Carteret ended his service as King George I’s Secretary of State for the Southern Department and was dispatched to Dublin as Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. Princess Caroline had to have shown her “library of the sage Merlin” to Lord Carteret at Richmond during that six-year interval. Meixell ([2005] 2006, 59, 64) and others have claimed that such an encounter with Carteret occurred well after Caroline and her husband acceded to the throne, which occurred in 1727, but this was four years after Carteret had seen to completion his first commission for his edition’s illustrations (1723), and a year after his illustration program had begun in earnest (1726). Carteret’s project’s actual chronology bears out Hammelmann’s posthumously published suppositions and Krahe’s more recent affirmation. Nevertheless, Meixell’s ([2005] 2006, 70–7) analysis of the role of Merlin in the novel is well-grounded and enlightening, and her arguments about Caroline’s dynastic interests, which follow those of Colton (1976, 12–14) and Gerrard (1994, 169–170), ring true: Caroline did attempt “to exploit Merlin’s prophetic aspect to legitimize Hanoverian rule” (Meixell [2005] 2006, 66). This “Carolinian” campaign would have begun before — and, in fact, did, as we have seen from Lord Carteret’s embarking on his own monumental project in the early 1720s — and continued after the Walese’s accession to the throne as King George II and Queen-Consort Caroline. Caroline would have founded her “library of the sage Merlin” on the basis of a collection of books, long before, as Queen Consort, she had the opportunity — or the means — to construct its architectural shrine. After living in England as the Princess of Wales for all of thirteen years, it is implausible that she would have waited until eight years after ascending to the throne to begin her campaign to defend and dignify the House of Hanover. The construction of Merlin’s Cave was the final, not the first, phase of her effort to “legitimize”, that is, to seek public acceptance for, the House of Hanover as the ruling monarchy in Great Britain.

We turn now to Merlin’s Cave, which Queen Caroline ordered to be built in the Richmond Lodge gardens.44 It was memorialized as a “silent scene of royal amusement” and “noble retirements” by Edmund

44. Richmond Lodge was located near the Thames in Richmond, London, on lands now identified as Old Deer Park; those grounds had been the site of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Richmond Palace.
Curll (A3i–ii) in The Rarities of Richmond: being exact descriptions of the Royal Hermitage and Merlin's Cave with his Life and Prophecies (London, 1736). It was built in the summer of 1735, about two and a half years before Caroline's death on 20 November 1737. British press announcements during the summer months of 1735 tell the story: The Grub Street Journal reported on 5 June 1735 that “A subterraneous work is by her majesty's order carrying on, in the royal gardens at Richmond, which is to be called Merlin's Cave, adorned with astronomical figures and characters”; the Daily Gazetteer noted on 21 July 1735 that “her Majesty, the Duke and the Princesses, went from Kensington to Kew to dine, and in the afternoon went to view the new Works, and Merlin's Cave, which is just finished”; The Gentleman's Magazine announced in its August 1735 issue that “The figures, her majesty had order'd for Merlin's Cave were placed therein”, and the Daily Journal of 16 August 1735 reported that other elements had been added: “They are curiosities representing Merlin's life, and the actions properest and fittest for the purpose, in order to beautify Merlin’s Cave, and finish the Design of the Work”; further reportage from the General Evening Post observed that “the exterior part of the said cave being near completed, her Majesty has been pleased to order a choice collection of English books to be placed therein”.45 No doubt Queen Caroline was installing some books that she had collected and shown to Lord Carteret many years earlier.

As to Caroline's habits of mind, she is known to have loved satirical spoof; Arkell (1939, 258) reports that on one occasion, during the monarchs' reign, the Court intimate Lord John Hervey entertained Queen Caroline “with verse and a playlet which dissected the intimates of the Court so amusingly that she forgave him her inclusion among the specimens”. The Princess-cum-Queen Consort obviously loved a good joke, and the world of fantasy clearly delighted her. Let's ask Curll (1736, B8), who offers us the guidance of Mrs. Stephen Duck, the wife of the “Cave-keeper”, to describe Merlin's Cave:

The Library appears in the neat Plainness of Quakerism, all the Books being covered with White-Vellum, and their Names written, in an indifferent Hand, upon their Backs. In the Middle of this Room, Mrs. Duck conducts you to Six Waxen Images, the handy Work of

45. The Gardens Trust (https://thegardenstrust.blog/2016/01/16/queen-caroline -merlins-cave/) reproduces in facsimile all these press announcements.
Mrs. Salmon, all taken from the Life, and said to represent the following Persons.46

These wax figures represented Merlin himself, Merlin’s secretary, Queen Elizabeth I (1533–1603), her nurse, Henry VII and his Queen Consort Elizabeth of York (1457–1509), and the Roman goddess Minerva (Curll 1736, B8–9). The sixth figure in Curll’s 1736 account, Minerva, the Roman goddess of war and the arts, was associated allegorically with King George II, who, as we have seen, was thus represented in the silver lottery medals struck in the same year, 1736.

Caroline’s selection of Merlin’s Cave companions was pertinent to the legendary Merlin’s most famous prophecy about King Arthur, namely, “the glorious return of Arthur to the throne of Britain”, with Henry VII and Queen Elizabeth I, in fact, having claimed to be Arthur’s rightful descendants (Meixell [2005] 2006, 66).47 In addition, Edmund Spenser had reiterated their claims in his epic poem, The Faerie Queen; Spenser’s Britomart visited Merlin’s cave and the sorcerer predicted that her descendants would consist of a long line of princes that would culminate “in Elizabeth, the true continuation of Arthur’s line” (Meixell (2005) 2006, 66). Citing Lord Hervey’s memoir, Arkell remarked that “the Queen loved Richmond Lodge as her private plaything, which she could alter or

46. The New York Public Library has Curll’s Rarities of Richmond imprint in its collections. It includes, among others, a full-page engraving titled “Merlin’s Cave in the Royal Gardens at Richmond” and another depicting the Cave’s six waxwork occupants. I would have included those engravings here but the NYPL’s Scan and Delivery Services has deemed the volume too fragile for scanning. See, however, Colton 1976 for six plates, one of which is a map of the gardens while another features the Cave’s six wax figures.

47. The origin of the Merlinesque prophecy and the Arthurian legend regarding England’s future goes back to Geoffrey of Monmouth, “a medieval English chronicler and bishop of St. Asaph, whose major work, the Historia regum Britannieae (History of the Kings of Britain), brought the figure of Arthur into European literature. [. . . ], published sometime between 1135 and 1139, it was one of the most popular books of the Middle Ages, although its historical value is almost nil” (https://www.britannica.com/biography/Geoffrey-of-Monmouth). Curll remarks that among Merlin’s magical feats, he transformed the face and form of king Uter Pendragon, who lusted after Lady Igren, the Duke of Cornwall’s wife, with the result that, disguised as the Duke, King Uter “dishonourably violated this Lady’s Chastity; in which Bed of Deceit the famous King Arthur was begot” (1736, 4).
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Improve on fancy” (1939, 186, 321n7). Its Merlin’s Cave was apparently of considerable annoyance to King George II, who did not appreciate its foolishness and extravagance (Quennell 1940, 231). He was not alone; for many, the assemblage at Richmond became the object of satire and scorn, ranging from playful contempt to ridicule (Colton 1796, 4–5).

There may have been an unintended but welcome consequence to Caroline’s creation of Merlin’s Cave, at least by those who considered it amusing, and this served another of Caroline’s purposes. It came not from the world of legend but rather from recent Hanoverian family history as well as her father-in-law’s conduct of his life at court as King George I. These factors were particularly troubling for Caroline’s pursuit of Hanoverian reputation and legitimacy in England. First, her own historical rank and role had been ominously foreshadowed by that of her mother-in-law, Sophia Dorothea of Brunswick-Lüneburg-Celle (1666–1726), the Electoral Princess of Hanover, the wife of Caroline’s father-in-law, George Louis (King George I), and Caroline’s husband’s mother. Divorced by her husband, Sophia Dorothea spent the last thirty-three years of her life, from 1694 to 1726, imprisoned in Hanover for adultery (Arkell 1939, 29–30, 137). In Caroline’s lifetime, this corresponded to the period that began in her early adolescence and continued through her tenure in England as Princess of Wales, concluding with Sophia Dorothea’s death, which occurred the year before Caroline’s ascent to the British throne on 11 June 1727. Second, Caroline had to contend with the fact that King George I kept three Hanoverian mistresses: “All three were self-seeking and avaricious — business women of the period who had adopted the only profession then open to hard-headed members of the submissive sex; none of them had the smallest pretension to intelligence or charm; but among them they set the tone of court society” (Quennell 1940, 13).

Thus, from the time of her arrival in England as Princess of Wales in 1714, Caroline had to create — and continually recreate “from scratch” — a public image of herself as the emblem of royal feminine dignity and moral worth. Caroline’s late materialization of Merlin’s Cave may have aided in satisfying that need by becoming a public attraction that was discussed in periodicals and opened to the public for visitors who took guided tours: “Inn-keepers and puppet-booth owners in the Richmond vicinity capitalized on the Cave’s popularity. A number of taverns changed their name to Merlin’s Cave, and coffee houses supplied ‘Merlin in Miniature’, scaled-down versions of Caroline’s figures” (Meixell [2005] 2006, 65–66).48

48. See also Gerrard (1994, 170) and The Gardens Trust (https://thegardenstrust .blog/2016/01/16/queen-caroline-merlins-cave/).
Given that her personal (and royal) challenge was to make her husband and herself accepted in the aristocratic circles as well as in the popular mind of the country in which she and he were foreigners, her creation of Merlin’s Cave was not only a way to cast herself and her husband in a magical glow of Merlinesque prophetic destiny but also to serve as a distraction from their recent and ongoing familial conundrum. Opening Richmond’s gardens and Merlin’s Cave to the public added an amusement-park-type attraction to satisfy the curiosity aroused by the presence of the new dynasty. Queen Consort Caroline’s Merlin’s Cave, exalting “Merlin, our British Wizard”, as Edmund Curll (1736, B1) called him, existed at Richmond Lodge for about thirty years. It was torn down in 1766.

To return to the topic of the Carteret-Caroline encounter and to conclude with a hypothetical question: As mentioned earlier, it would have been impossible for a Carteret-Caroline meeting to have occurred after the construction at Richmond of Merlin’s Cave in 1735, because by that time Carteret’s sixty-eight commissioned engravings for his 1738 edition of the Quixote had been complete for half a dozen years. And we cannot overlook Queen Caroline’s unfounded dismissiveness of Carteret in 1733 as “a liar and a knave”. Being out of favor with Queen Caroline in the 1730s, Lord Carteret was probably never entertained at Richmond’s Merlin’s Cave. But if he had been, we wonder hypothetically, would he have been dismissive of this “silent scene of royal amusement”, as it was called by the enthusiastic Edmund Curll (1736, A3i)? Carteret’s appreciation of Cervantes clearly included the solemn jocularity and generosity of human sympathy evoked by John Oldfield’s essay and conveyed by its Vanderbank/Van der Gucht engravings.

Would Lord Carteret not have imagined Queen Caroline’s fantastical Merlin’s Cave to be a real-life variant simulacrum of the more enduring literary simulacrum, namely, Cervantes’s fictional cave of Montesinos and its promises? We recall that, after his subterranean visit to the cave, Don Quixote assured his interlocutors that Montesinos had told him that “the wise Merlin” (el sabio Merlín) had prophesied many things about him, including his future disenchantment of Dulcinea and her companions and others, because “great deeds are reserved for great men” (que las grandes

49. Merlin’s Cave at Richmond and its simulacra in local taverns and coffee houses predated Copenhagen’s famous Tivoli Gardens, founded in 1843, by more than a century.

50. The Gardens Trust (https://thegardenstrust.blog/2016/01/16/queen-caroline-merlins -cave/).
hazañas por los grandes hombres están guardadas) (Cervantes de Saavedra 1738, vol. 3: 213 [pt. 2, ch. 23]). 51 Was such greatness of aspiration and accomplishment not reserved for those who had the power to imagine it? Would that proclivity not have included Lord Carteret and Princess Caroline in their desire to create, respectively, a great monument to European literary culture and an enduring acceptance in the British monarchy?

What the English lord and the German princess shared were interests that extended beyond the lands of their respective births. His was as a diplomat and intellectual, living mostly in his native England, but whose scholarly vision extended to ancient and modern societies and cultures other than his own. Hers was as a German princess who had lived in her native Hanover until, in resplendent womanhood, she arrived in England as the new Princess of Wales who would come to rule with her husband as monarchs over lands to which they were both foreigners. What Lord Carteret and Princess Caroline shared — although to what degree we cannot know — was an expansive, national-border-breaking cultural vision. In a real sense, they were both “foreigners”, or rather, the interests of both were not confined to being “native-born”. Both had interests that extended beyond those confines — Carteret, by the force of his intellectual interests and diplomatic career; Caroline, by the dual force of her cultural-intellectual interests and her practical social necessity in the face of recent Hanoverian history and current royal conduct.

Carteret sponsored the London edition of *Vida y hechos del ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha* and shepherded it through to publication as a project that realized his expansive cultural vision. As Lord Carteret’s biographers have demonstrated, his view of royal and legislative politics was professionally engaged but personally disinterested. For Lord Carteret, the “real” cave — above ground or below — was not that of a waxen figure of Merlin in an English royal garden but rather that of a fictional Don Quixote, who existed on Cervantes’s pages and in the eye of the mind of the readers who read and relished his immortal novel. These included himself, as a polyglot English nobleman who would fail as a British statesman but succeed as a patron of European literary culture. And it would have included his intended reader, if Juan Antonio Mayán’s account is to be credited, that is, the desires of a German princess who did not live to see Carteret’s edition completed but whose mind accommodated philosophy and fantasy

51. Modern Spanish usage would prescribe “para” rather than “por”: “que las grandes hazañas para los grandes hombres están guardadas”.
and whose actions, in her sequential roles as Princess of Wales and Queen Consort — never mind her late waxwork fantasy — played a historic, foundational role in the establishment and acceptance of the House of Hanover in Great Britain. Making or remaking one’s public identity or that of an institution much larger than oneself — call it “transformation”, if you like — is, after all, what the figure of Don Quixote has always been all about. How quixotic.

Yale University
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