

Being published in the proceedings of the seminar “Entre Cervantes y Shakespeare. Sendas del Renacimiento” (Juan de la Cuesta).

At the end is a listing of changes (updates and corrections) in this version, with respect to the published version.

The Man who made *Don Quixote* a Classic: The Rev. John Bowle¹

Daniel Eisenberg

No one can understand Cervantes fully that does not come to my school.²

The knowledge of languages you may remember was ever a favourite pursuit with me, and surely the knowledge of them more than anything else tends to the enlarging and extending our ideas. Among these the Spanish, that glorious, majestick tongue that according to my notions of it is far above all others now existing, has been particularly cultivated by me...³

John Bowle

Cervantine scholars, a fractious and quarrelsome lot, do agree that the importance of *Don*

¹Versions of this paper were presented at the symposia “Entre Cervantes y Shakespeare. Sendas del Renacimiento”, Universidad de Huelva, April 13–15, 2004; “*Don Quixote*: The First 400 Years”, Hofstra University, November 5, 2004; and “*Don Quijote*, 1605–2005”, City University of New York Graduate Center, September 23, 2005. That this paper has grown and added so many notes reflects the fact that the facsimile of Bowle’s edition has now been published (Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 2006), which greatly stimulated and facilitated my work while preparing this paper for publication.

²From a letter to Thomas Percy of July 28, 1780, published in *Cervantine Correspondence*, ed. Daniel Eisenberg, Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1987, pp. 59–62, the quote on p. 60. These letters may be read online, with corrections, at <<http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/cervantes/bowle.pdf>> (4 July 2003). Although the previous version is to be preferred, they are also available at <<http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?Ref=10759>> (9 Sept. 2005). The excerpts given in the present article have had their eighteenth-century capitalization modernized.

³From a letter to a Rev. Mr. Warren of August 8, 1772, quoted by R. Merritt Cox, *An English Ilustrado: The Reverend John Bowle*, Bern, Frankfurt-am-Main, Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1977, p. 59.

Quixote was first recognized in England. In 1738 there appeared in London the first deluxe edition, that of Tonson, which paid tribute to the work and was accompanied, as is well known, by the first biography of Cervantes, that of Gregorio Mayans y Siscar, as well as many illustrations.⁴

The most important contribution to Cervantine studies in eighteenth-century England, however, was the annotated edition of John Bowle, published in 1781 at his own expense and with the support of what subscribers he could find.⁵ Whereas Lord Carteret, sponsor of the 1738 edition, said that the work was “la más graciosa y agradable obra de invención que jamás salió

⁴Mayans was at the time Spain’s foremost literary scholar and humanist. His biography of Cervantes is included in Charles Jarvis’s translation of *Don Quixote*, published in London in 1742 by the same publisher, Tonson, that published the 1738 Spanish edition which is used so extensively by Bowle, despite its textual shortcomings which he comments on so pointedly in his *Letter to Dr. Percy* (see n. 82, below). It has been edited with introduction and notes by Antonio Mestre, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1972, and may be read online, without Mestre’s useful introduction and notes, in the Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes (<<http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?Ref=7670>>, 26 April 2006). According to Diego Martínez Torrón, “el lector actual puede consultar en la Biblioteca Valenciana Digital (BIVALDI) — <<http://bv2.gva.es>> — ...la versión Web del CD-ROM *Mayans y Siscar digital*, obras completas, epistolario y bibliografía realizado en 2002 por Biblioteca Valenciana, Fundación Hernando Larramendi y DIGIBIS Publicaciones digitales”. (Taken from his “El *Quijote* de John Bowle”, in *Cervantes y el ámbito anglosajón*, ed. Diego Martínez Torrón y Bernd Dietz, Madrid: Sial, 2005, pp. 241–317, this quotation on p. 275 n. 112. The same article is also available with the title “John Bowle y el cervantismo español en la Ilustración y el Romanticismo”, in *Cervantes y su mundo III*, ed. A. Robert Lauer y Kurt Reichenberger, Kassel: Reichenberger, 2005, pp. 419–504.)

The illustrations of the 1738 edition may be seen in the *Banco de imágenes del Quijote, 1605–1905*, <<http://www.qbi2005.com>> (30 Jan. 2006), and in the digital archive of the Urbina-Proyecto Cervantes collection, <<http://www.csd.tamu.edu/cervantes/V2/images/intro-spa.html>> (24 April 2006). On the latter collection, see Fernando González Moreno, Eduardo Urbina, Richard Furuta, and Jie Deng, “La colección de *Quijotes* ilustrados del Proyecto Cervantes: Catálogo de ediciones y archivo digital de imágenes”, *Cervantes*, XXV, 1 (2005 [2006]), pp. 79–103, available shortly at <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/bcsas05htm>>.

⁵Bowle’s entrepreneurial and financial skills deserve to be recognized along with his scholarly accomplishments. He was able to publicize his project effectively and to manage single-handedly a large and expensive publishing enterprise. That there were as many subscribers as there were to an expensive edition in a foreign language also speaks well of the level of culture in late eighteenth-century England. It took Bowle less time to obtain his subscribers (four years) than it has taken to get the 2006 facsimile published, even though today Cervantine studies is a well-established discipline. John J. Allen called for the reprint in 1989 (in a review of *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. 2, above), *Hispanic Review*, LVII (1989), p. 234), and it has been a project of R. Merritt Cox since the late 1960s.

en el mundo”, a “libro original y único en su género”,⁶ Bowle goes much further: he is the first to apply the label “classic” to Cervantes. This is an important turning point. However, Bowle uses the term not for *Don Quixote*, but rather for Cervantes the man and author, and for his own edition of *Don Quixote*. A classical author requires and deserves what Bowle calls “a classical edition”: one with an accurate text and explanatory notes.

While Mayans wrote the first biography, Bowle was the first *cervantista*, the first *Don Quixote* scholar, carrying out research so as to better understand the work. He is also the first to whom the term “Hispanist” was applied.⁷ But despite his enthusiasm for *Don Quixote*, his greatest admiration is for Cervantes. He calls him an “insigne varón” (III, p. 5), “honor y gloria...de todo el género humano” (III, p. 32).⁸ Citing these words, Clemencín criticized Bowle for being overly enthusiastic about Cervantes.⁹

⁶Quoted by Mestre (see previous note), p. xliv. On Lord Carteret and his edition, see Amanda Meixell, “Queen Caroline’s Merlin Grotto and the 1738 Lord Carteret Edition of *Don Quijote*: The Matter of Britain and Spain’s Arthurian Tradition”, *Cervantes*, in press (<<http://www2.h-net.msu.edu/~cervantes/bcsalist.htm>>).

⁷“Baretti emplea ya la palabra ‘Hispanist’” (Franco Meregalli, “El *Quijote*, Giuseppe Baretti y John Bowle”, in *Philologica Hispaniensa in honorem Manuel Alvar*, Madrid: Gredos, 1986, III, pp. 280–284, the quotation on p. 282; reprinted as “Don Quijote [sic], Giuseppe Baretti y John Bowle” in his *La literatura desde el punto de vista del receptor*, Amsterdam–Atlanta: Rodopi, 1989, pp. 84–90). He uses it repeatedly (pp. 147, 162, 170, 171, 183, etc.) in his book attacking Bowle, *Tolondron*, which will be discussed later. (The page numbers of *Tolondron* refer to my edition, *Tolondron. Speeches to John Bowle about his Edition of Don Quixote, together with Some Account of Spanish Literature*, ed. Daniel Eisenberg, *Cervantes* XXIII, 2 (2003), pp. 141–274. Online: <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/articf03/tolondron.pdf>>, 30 June 2005.)

⁸The volume and page references are in all cases to the 2006 reprint of Bowle’s edition by Juan de la Cuesta of Newark, DE, preface by Eduardo Urbina, introduction (29 pp.) by Daniel Eisenberg. In some instances I have modernized Bowle’s orthography.

Bowle’s edition is also available online in Eduardo Urbina’s *Proyecto Cervantes*, with the text and notes displayed in parallel scrolling windows: <<http://csdll.cs.tamu.edu:8080/veri/indexBowle.html>> (1 Dec. 2005).

⁹“[E]ntusiasta ciego de Cervantes, a quien llama *honor y gloria no solamente de su patria, pero de todo el género humana*, no trató jamás de hacer ninguna observación crítica ni de juzgar del mérito o demérito de la fábula. Sus anotaciones presentan el aspecto de una erudición laboriosa, pero seca y descarnada: son como un almacén donde se hallan hacinadas mercancías de todas clases, unas de mayor y otras de menor precio... [ellipsis in original] mas no se trate de relevar los defectos de un extranjero, que ya experimentó los tiros de la crítica en su país y que solo debe hallar estimación y gratitud en el nuestro”. (“Prólogo del comentario”, in *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, Edición IV Centenario, Madrid: Castilla, 1966, p. 998; available online at <<http://www.proyectoquijote.com/cms/Catalogo+Obra-11.html>>, 1 May 2006; archived at <<http://www.h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=H-Cervantes&month=0508>>

Bowle meant, as he explains, that because of both Cervantes' virtue and his learning — his “dilatada erudición” (III, p. 6) — he was a great author, of permanent value to humanity. In Bowle's words, and again he is the first to make this comparison: “Our countryman Shakespeare has no competitor in the article of great original genius, but his illustrious contemporary Cervantes”.¹⁰ “I possess the highest reverence and esteem for that country which has produced so wonderful a genius[;] I can find no excuse for Father Feijoo's total silence of his name in his *Glorias de España*, of which he was so great an ornament. He was an honour not only to his country but to mankind, for I am certain from his writings, that of the two, his great genius and abilities were inferior to the goodness and honesty of the man. He is therefore to be regarded as a citizen of the world, and all have an interest in him”.¹¹

John Bowle and his edition are well documented. In large part this is due to his correspondence, much but not all of which has been published. Living in a small, rural town as he did, Bowle wrote frequently to other men of letters. Not only that, he saved the letters he received, pasting them into an album. Only a small number of letters that he sent have been preserved among the papers of their recipients, but fortunately, and thanks to Bowle himself, we have for many years of his life the drafts of the letters he sent. When writing a letter, he started by writing a draft in a blank book, and then made a fair copy of this draft to send. The album and book of drafts are today in the Bowle-Evans Collection in the University of Cape Town. From them I have edited the letters he exchanged with his most important correspondent, the scholar and editor Thomas Percy, whose never-realized Cervantes translation project antedated Bowle's editorial endeavor and who, for the first but not the last time, tried with only partial success to

&week=e&msg=8xpDYldImrVTfP%2b/RChbYg>, 15 Oct. 2005).)

¹⁰John Bowle, *A Letter to Dr. Percy*, ed. Daniel Eisenberg, *Cervantes XXI*, 1 (2001), pp. 95–146, the quote on p. 116 (online: <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/artics01/bowle2.pdf>>, 15 Oct. 2005). A Spanish translation by Rafael Carretero Muñoz was published as “Una carta al doctor Percy por John Bowle” in *Sobre Cervantes*, ed. Diego Martínez Torrón, Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2003, pp. 231–272 (online: <<http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/cervantes/bowlespan.pdf>>, 9 Sept. 2005).

¹¹*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 134. Similarly: “This last account of himself with every one of his writings, have confirmed me in my notion, that the goodness of the man was equal to the grandeur of the genius. Sure I am, that good-nature and candour, charity, humanity, and compassion for the infirmities of man in his most abject state, and consequently an abhorrence of cruelty, persecution, and violence, the principal moral he seems to inculcate in his great work, were the glorious virtues and predominant good qualities of his soul, and must transmit his name to the latest ages with every eulogium due to so exalted a character”. (*Letter to Gentleman's Magazine*, LI (1781), pp. 22–24; in “Correspondence”, *Cervantes XXIII*, 2 (2003), pp. 119–140, the letter to *Gentleman's Magazine* on pp. 125–127 and the quotation on p. 126. Online: <<http://h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/articf03/correspondence.pdf>>, 16 Sept. 2005),

assemble the books in Don Quixote's library.¹² My work was much facilitated by the late R. Merritt Cox, the modern champion of Bowle, who lent me his microfilm of the letters after he had used them as the primary source for his biography of Bowle.¹³

More recently I published the letters Bowle sent and received in Spanish.¹⁴ Of these there are fewer, because there was no international mail service, and mail to and from Spain had to be transported by friends, or friends of friends, who were traveling. However, mail within England was organized and reliable; in nearby Salisbury there was a post office, which Bowle refers to.¹⁵ This was, in general, a period of much correspondence, in both England and in its colonies.¹⁶

The later eighteenth century was also a time in which educated individuals without specialized training could do research in many fields, present the results at meetings of learned societies, and publish in their learned journals, both of which — the societies and their journals — were by today's standards very broad in scope. Bowle, with a Master of Arts from Oxford, was an antiquary, someone who studied history, broadly understood. He was a fellow, of which he was immensely proud, of the influential Society of Antiquaries of London, in whose journal he published on a variety of topics at the same time he was working on his edition of Cervantes.¹⁷ He lived in the village of Idmiston, 10 miles from the major ecclesiastical center of Salisbury and 100 miles to the west of London, and he preferred living there; he certainly could have lived elsewhere if he had wanted to. He enjoyed hunting, and liked his dogs. Inherited land produced income for him, so he was not dependent on the parish for his livelihood. Although he was a member of the clergy he was not much concerned with religious questions, and such topics seldom appear in his correspondence.

Bowle was also not much interested in family. He married and had two daughters, but his

¹²On both the translation project and the reconstruction of Don Quixote's library, see *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. [2](#), above), pp. vii–viii.

¹³Cox's biography is cited in n. [3](#), above. On Cox see George Greenia and Daniel Eisenberg, "R. Merritt Cox (1939–1987): Pioneer of John Bowle Studies", *Cervantes* XXIII, 2 (2003), pp. 5–8, <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/articf03/cox.pdf>> (30 Aug. 2005).

¹⁴"Correspondence" (n. [11](#), above). In that publication, I erroneously wrote (p. 120) that Pellicer's first letter to Bowle, of July 20, 1778, was lost. In fact Bowle published it in his edition, III, pp. 16–17.

¹⁵"Correspondence" (n. [11](#), above) p. 132.

¹⁶One of the first steps toward American independence was the setting up of "Committees of Correspondence".

¹⁷"Remarks on the Word 'Romance'", *Archaeologia*, V (1779), pp. 267–271; "Miscellaneous Observations on Parish Registers", *Archaeologia*, VIII (1781), pp. 67–78; and "Observations on Card-Playing", *Archaeologia*, VIII (1781), pp. 147–151. Cox cites the following in *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above), p. 115, without giving years or full pagination: "Remarks on the Ancient Pronunciation of the French Language", *Archaeologia*, VI, p. 76; and "Remarks on Some Musical Instruments Mentioned in the *Roman de la Rose*", *Archaeologia*, VII, p. 214.

wife died only five years into the marriage, and Bowle never remarried nor seems to have had much interest in women. (Nor men either, in case there are any *malpensados* present.) One daughter married her cousin, Bowle's nephew, who also lived in Idmiston, and the other daughter died at a young age. Bowle rarely refers to any of them in his letters; he seems more interested in his dogs.¹⁸

So Bowle was, then, a man with little in the way of family, and little that he was required to do; he could devote himself to his reading and research, and go to Salisbury or London whenever he felt like it. (He did so frequently.) His “highest joy”, he wrote, were books. Even the arranging of them on his shelves was “a matter of amusement to me”. Certainly he would “never suffer Cervantes and Avellaneda to stand on the same shelf, lest a real battle should ensue”.¹⁹

Through Bowle's correspondence we can see the life of a scholar of 250 years ago. His “astonishment as [his notes] arise out of a Chaos”²⁰ is an experience many of us can relate to. Perhaps some can also relate to his dedication to scholarly activity so as to prevent depression.²¹ In searching for books to “illustrate” the text of *Don Quixote*, the primary theme of his letters,

¹⁸One of his them, named “Perro Grande”, was poisoned, and Bowle had his skin tanned and used to bind two of his memorandum books. He then printed a broadside, bound into one of the books, telling us about the dog. This broadside was reproduced on the back cover of the issue of *Cervantes* dedicated to Bowle. It may be seen online at <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/bcsaf03.htm>> (20 Sept. 2005). Both of the dogskin-bound books are in the Bowle-Evans collection of the University of Cape Town.

¹⁹These quotes are from a letter to the bookseller Thomas Davies of May 12, 1780 (Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 80).

²⁰From a letter to Percy of 28 July, 1780, in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. 2, above) pp. 59–62, the quote on p. 60.

²¹“I hope to kiss your hands in town before Christmas when I hope to have finished one of my Herculean Labours, my Indexing [of proper names], which not a little fatigues my patience and perseverance and hardly allows me leisure hour, but it is good to have employment if it be only to drive away disgust and displeasing reflection, which effect thank God I often feel in the solitary pleasure of my own pursuits”. (From a letter to Gustavus Brander, October 20, 1779, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 76). Similarly, to John Talbot Dillon on November 18, 1779: “Did not some bright gleams at times appear to enliven my dull and dreary roads, there would be no passing along tolerably” (quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* p. 76). His attitude toward newspapers is also revealing: “As bad news and bad news repeated, the constant subject matter of our [news]papers wherever they speak truth, have for several years back been their uniform language, I have long taken a disgust to them and but seldom look into them” (letter to Dillon of April 6, 1780, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* p. 79).

we find that he had to visit the British Museum, and for a book not available there, Oxford.²² Most, however, were purchased or lent by Percy and other friends, to peruse at leisure at home in Idmiston. Here is an excerpt from a letter to Percy of July 28, 1772, that allows us to see the scholar at work with an intimacy that is not possible with any other Cervantine editor:

You have satisfied would I could add gratified my curiosity with Avellaneda: where every thing is to be condemned the sooner we pass sentence the better: for my part I subscribe implicitly to the devil's testimony of the book in the 70th Cpter of the 2d. part of Q....²³ If to be in every thing the reverse of Cervantes will entitle the writer to any degree of merit he has a superabundant share of it. He has two novels I know not which is most disgusting the silly legendary story in one, or the shocking Indecency of the other. In a word it almost refutes what Cervantes has twice advanced [II, 3; II, 59] — no ay libro tan malo que no tenga alguna cosa buena. The only use I can make of it is that it in one or two instances will occasionally explain some part of his text, in every other respect tis too contemptible to merit any kind of notice, & is sunk into oblivion against which it is not possible for all the art of man to buoy it up. I hope to return all your books when I come to town in December. Palmerin de Oliva stands ready for embowelling in which situation he has been for more than a twelve month past: I shall soon begin my operations on him. From a frequent attentive perusal of the Refranes of the Comendador Griego who is mentioned P.2.C.34 I find that there is much more proverbial diction in Quixote than is generally known.²⁴

Also contributing to our knowledge of Bowle is the fact that many of his working materials have come down to us. We have the original notes for his annotations, written on blank pages he had bound into an earlier edition, plus many loose slips stuck in when he ran out of room on those blank pages. This volume is in the library of the Hispanic Society of America. Bowle says that his indexes “han sido trasladados quatro veces” (III, p. 360); while we do not have these four manuscripts, we do have his “Vocabulario cervantesco”, his original word index. Dated 1767–72, like his notes just mentioned it was made on an interleaved copy of a book, in this case Franciosini's *Vocabulario español e italiano*.²⁵ A manuscript of his “Indice general del

²²Letter to Dillon of December 5, 1779, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 77.

²³What the devil said was “si de propósito yo mismo me pusiera a hazerle peor, no acertara” (roughly, “I couldn't make it worse even if I tried”).

²⁴*Cervantine Correspondence* (n. 2, above) pp. 22–23.

²⁵It is located in a public library in Manchester, England. For further information, see my “La edición del *Quijote* de John Bowle (1781). Sus dos emisiones”, *Cervantes XXIII*, 2 (2003), pp. 45–84, the references to this *Vocabulario* on p. 51 n. 18 and p. 53 n. 23. According to the same article, n. 23, Bowle also bound additional pages into a copy of the 1738 edition, used to index and write additions to Mayans' life of Cervantes. This article is available online at <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/articf03/eisenberg.pdf>> (9 Sept. 2005).

texto” is conserved in the Bowle-Evans Collection of the University of Cape Town.²⁶ We have three catalogs of his library, in addition to the many mentions of books in his correspondence. However, we only have one of his three copies of Tonson’s 1738 edition; Francisco Rico tells us that one of the missing copies was used as printer’s copytext. It is probably in some English library.²⁷

The creation of his edition is also well known because early in 1777, four years before it appeared, so as to obtain subscribers Bowle published a 50-page pamphlet introducing readers to Cervantes and describing his editorial project.²⁸ This is his *A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Percy, concerning a New and Classical Edition of Historia del valeroso cavallero don Quixote de la Mancha, to be illustrated by Annotations and Extracts from the Historians, Poets, and Romances of Spain, and Italy, and Other Writers Ancient and Modern, with a Glossary, and Indexes*, of 1777. I edited this text and published it in *Cervantes* in 2001, calling it “the founding document of *Don Quijote* scholarship”.²⁹ In it Bowle discusses, for the first time, the textual problems of the work, the necessity of going back to the first editions, and the need for an accurate text that does not correct, for example, Sancho’s linguistic errors. He also points out how much the text will be misunderstood, or incompletely understood, if it is not accompanied by explanatory notes. As promised at the *Letter*’s conclusion, it was followed shortly by a bilingual *Prospectus de suscripción* of four pages, giving samples of the text and notes, a price (three guineas), and information telling how to acquire the work in both England and Spain.³⁰

²⁶ For a description, see my “Dos emisiones” (n. [25](#), above) p. 51 n. 19. It is dated “1767, 8, 9, 1770, 1, 2”.

²⁷For the books from Bowle’s library that have been located, see my “Dos emisiones” (n. [25](#), above) p. 53 n. 23. On the use of one of his copies of the 1738 edition as printer’s copy, see Francisco Rico, “Historia del texto”, in *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, ed. Francisco Rico, Barcelona: Círculo de Lectores–Galaxia Gutenberg, 2004, pp. ccxxi–cclxxvi, at p. ccxlix.

²⁸That it was very early in 1777 can be told because Percy thanks Bowle for it in a letter of February 3, 1777 (in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. [2](#), above) pp. 44–45), and Casimiro Gómez Ortega referred to it, writing from Madrid on February 13, 1777 (III, p. 17). While Ortega speaks of the “prospectus”, presumably this is a reference to the *Letter* to Percy rather than to the subsequent *Prospectus*.

²⁹John Bowle, *A Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 95.

³⁰“Antonio Sancha” was the agent for subscriptions in Spain. The first page of this now-rare *Prospectus* is reproduced in “Dos emisiones” (n. [25](#), above) p. 60, from the copy located in the Clark Memorial Library at UCLA. It reflects typographical experiments of Bowle. There is a sample page of text with 34 lines (numbered), whereas in his edition Bowle’s edition his pages are most often of 29 lines, and never over 30; more leading (space between lines) is used in the edition. On this sample page, numbered 146, is a passage from Chapter 19 of Part I; the passage appears in the published edition on I, p. 144 l. 25 through I, p. 145 l. 24. The punctuation and spelling are quite different in the two versions: the grave accent is used in the *Prospectus* and the

The published *Letter* had influence in its own right. Bowle's edition of 1781 was preceded by the Spanish Academy's edition of 1780, which greatly and unfairly eclipsed Bowle's accomplishments. But Bowle's project was known in Spain; in a letter of February 13, 1777, the botanist, translator, and man of letters Casimiro Gómez Ortega describes the reaction of "todos los Eruditos, y singularmente de la Academia de la Lengua Castellana".³¹ Ortega passed the map in the *Letter* along to "[e]l mejor geógrafo que aqui tenemos" (III, p. 17), Tomás

acute in the edition, although in the *Prospectus* the preposition is also written â; whereas the *Prospectus* accentuates *litèra, matàra, quanto*, and *dixo*, in the edition we find *litera, matara, quantó*, and *dixó*; *huessos* becomes *huesos*, *Baeça* becomes *Baeza*, and *caydo* becomes *caído*.

After 11 more lines of text on p. 147, Bowle places his notes on the passage; those found in the edition are more extensive. Then there follows, without break, a hodgepodge of notes on various topics in both parts, apparently intended to exhibit the diversity of sources used.

In my edition of the *Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. 10, above), which is prior to the *Prospectus* since it includes an announcement of it (reproduced on p. 146 of my edition), some but not all of the sample pages published with it were reproduced. These also shed light on the progress of Bowle's endeavors. They are, in their entirety: 4 sample pages of the index, pp. 57–60 (words and proper names combined); 3 pages of index to the "Carta de España, acomodada a la historia de Don Quixote", with page and line numbers of the "London" [1738] edition, although most of these names are not on the published map (pp. 61–63). P. 64 is a translation of some of the geographical terms, pp. 65–66 are an index to the *Letter* ("Pineda unqualified for the Office of Editor, 26, 7; his absurd Punctuation, Errors, Omissions, and Alterations 28, 29, 54, 5"). P. 67 is the list of "romances" reproduced later in this article, followed by "FINIS" at the bottom of the page. However, in the *Letter* there is no sample of the text of the edition.

³¹This is how his name is given in the list of Subscribers (III, p. 355), which presumably reflects his own signature; Bowle always refers to him as "Casimiro de Ortega". The quote is from III, p. 17; Bowle copies out more of the same letter of Ortega to the Spanish consul Miguel de Ventades in his letter to Percy of October 27, 1777 (in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. 2, above) p. 50).

In addition to his important scientific works, Gómez Ortega published *La célebre écloga primera de Garcilaso de la Vega: con su traducción italiana en el mismo metro, por Juan Bautista Conti. La da a luz con el prólogo, resumen de la vida del poeta, y algunas observaciones Casimiro Gómez Ortega*, Madrid: Ibarra, 1771. On him, see F. Javier Puerto Sarmiento, *Ciencia de cámara: Casimiro Gómez Ortega, 1741-1818, el científico cortesano*, Madrid: CSIC, 1992.

On Ventades, who was an intermediary but who was deliberately omitted from Bowle's acknowledgments, see Cox, *Ilustrado* pp. 66, 67, 68, 84, 85, and 91. On p. 85 Cox quotes a letter of Dillon of March 28, 1781: "As to Ventades if you knew what a contemptible light he is held in, both in England and Spain in other respect than as a *Contador*, as well as I do; you would be convinced, entre nous, his name would be of no consequence. I speak from a knowledge of thirty years standing".

López, who wrote Bowle with suggestions and corrections.³² His correspondent John Talbot Dillon discussed Bowle's project and showed the *Prospectus* and *Letter to Mayans*³³ and to the royal librarian, Juan Antonio Pellicer.³⁴ The latter wrote Bowle on July 20, 1778 with admiration, enclosing "la primera hoja"³⁵ or what Bowle elsewhere calls a "specimen"³⁶ of his "Noticias para la vida de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra", then in press.³⁷ His *Letter to Dr. Percy* and *Prospectus*, then, were read by and influenced those who were preparing the much better financed Academy edition, which included the dedications, an improved map, and a very limited set of textual notes. It was in 1777 that the printing of the 1780 edition began (Rico, p. ccxlv).

Bowle's edition itself provides materials with which to understand its creation. Following

³²Eisenberg, "Dos emisiones" (n. [25](#), above) p. 50 n. 14. Bowle's first map, published in his *A Letter to Dr. Percy*, is reproduced on p. 143 of my edition of the *Letter* (n. [10](#), above). A better-quality reproduction, with annotations, is found in *Los mapas del Quijote* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nacional, 2005), pp. 40–41. In the same volume one can find Bowle's map as revised in his edition (pp. 52–53), and the far superior map of López (pp. 41–51), commented on by Ronald Hilton in Chapter 6, "Le Cervantisme Anglais au 18eme Siècle", of his *La Légende noire au 18e siècle: Le monde hispanique vu du dehors*, Starkville, Mississippi: Historical Text Archive, 2002, published online only: <<http://www.historicaltextarchive.com/books.php?op=viewbook&bookid=8&pre=1>> (22 July 2003). Hilton criticizes Bowle in the same chapter for not knowing the "la belle carte de la Péninsule publiée à Londres, chez Robert Sayer, en 1772".

López was the author of the *Atlas geográfico del reino de España*, first published in 1757. Bowle never mentions this book and may never have known that it existed.

³³Letter of Bowle to Percy of August 17, 1778, in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. [2](#), above) pp. 53–54.

³⁴"Después que vi el *Prospectus* de la Obra, que anduvo por esta corte, y principalmente después que leí unas cartas de Vm. que me franqueó amistosamente el Señ. Baron de Dillon..." (Letter of Pellicer of July 20, 1778, published by Bowle, III, p. 16).

³⁵III, p. 16; "Correspondence" (n. [11](#), above) p. 126.

³⁶Letter of Bowle to Percy of August 17, 1778, in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. [2](#), above) p. 54.

³⁷Pellicer's life of Cervantes was published in his *Ensayo de una bibliotheca de traductores españoles: donde se da noticia de las traducciones que hay en castellano de la Sagrada Escritura, Santos Padres, Filósofos, Historiadores, Médicos, Oradores, Poetas, así griegos como latinos y de otros autores que han florecido antes de la invención de la imprenta. Preceden varias noticias literarias para las vidas de otros escritores españoles*, Madrid: Sancha, 1778, reprinted with a prologue of Miguel Ángel Lama, Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, 2002.

the suggestion of Cervantes' friend in the prologue to *Don Quixote* Part I,³⁸ he published at the beginning of his notes a 6½ page alphabetical list of the books cited in them (III, pp. 19–25). To give you a sense of its depth, I will read only the entries beginning with the letter F (III, p. 21):

Fajardo, Diego Saavedra
 Febo, Cavallero del
 Felixmarte de Hircania
 Flores, Pedro, *Romancero general*
Floresta española por Melchior de Santa Cruz
 Florus[,] Lucius [a Roman historian]
 Franciosini, “el Traductor Italiano”
 Du Fresne [a seventeenth-century French philologist and historian]

In about half of the cases, the entry is accompanied by the place or places in the text where it has been cited.

A little typographical archeology, plus his correspondence, reveals more of how Bowle worked. Volumes I and II contain the text, with the lines numbered, but without any annotations or introduction.³⁹ Bowle's correspondence reveals that printing of the text was underway in 1778, three years before the publication of the edition, and completed no later than June of 1779.⁴⁰ His two introductions, one to his “Comento” or notes and one to the indexes, are found in Volume III, together with the notes, indexes, and what he calls “Varias lecciones”: parallel-column listings of the textual differences between four editions of Part I and three of Part II. The text, then, was printed before he put his notes in final form. He needed the text, with its

³⁸He says this — that he is following Cervantes — in his letter to Dillon of August 5, 1778, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 72. Bowle was unaware of the attack on Lope in the prologue to Part I.

³⁹Throughout this discussion I am treating the volumes of the edition as they are in the facsimile, with text in Volumes I and II and the notes and indexes in Volume III. For the six tomes and the varying ways the set is found in different copies (bound into two to six volumes), and for the misbound title pages in a number of copies, see my “Dos emisiones” (cited in n. [25](#), above).

⁴⁰In a letter of March 2, 1778, to an unidentified “Revd. Mr. Powel”, we find that “I have begun and am actually embarked in my arduous Quixotick expedition. I am plunged into the Printers sea of Ink” (“Correspondence” (n. [11](#), above) p. 120). Writing to Pellicer on February 25, 1779, he says that “La primera parte del Texto esta finalizada” (“Correspondence” p. 121). This must refer to printing and not preparation of printer's copy, because in a letter to John Crookshanks of March 7, 1779, he writes “Pray inform Antonio Sancho que he impreso casi cincuenta y dos capítulos de la segunda parte de D. Q. y que espero finalizar el texto de entrambas, Deo volente, en otro mes, poco mas o menos” (quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 75). By June 30, 1779 the printing of the text was completed, because he wrote on that date to Dillon that he had a working copy of both parts “bound up” (letter to Dillon of June 30, 1779, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 75).

numbered lines, in order to prepare his indexes, and had a working copy of his edition of the text of both parts bound in 1779.⁴¹ Using the indexes he then prepared the final manuscript of his notes, which, as he points out (III, p. 9), are full of cross-references.⁴² The draft of most of the notes, however, was complete by late 1778.⁴³

Of the materials in Volume III, the indexes were completed and printed first. They have no page numbers, which indicate that they were not printed as a set, all given to the printer at the same time.⁴⁴ There are separate indexes to each part — an index to Part I, and then an index to Part II, and for the proper names only, a short index of the indexes telling in which part each name is found. The first to be completed, and presumably the first printed, was the word index, as will be discussed shortly. Following it came the name index; a letter confirms that the name index of Part I was being printed while he was working on the name index to Part II.⁴⁵ The

⁴¹“A copy of both parts I have bound up, for the purpose of adapting my past labours to my own purpose and which, by the references to page and line, the easiest and most commode than can be for the reader, will of course be confined to my own edition wholly, in the Indices especially”. (From a letter to Dillon of June 30, 1779, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 75).

⁴²Confirmation of this is found in his letter to Percy of July 28, 1780, published in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. 2, above) pp. 59–62. Bowle reports that he visited Samuel Johnson, and “left with him the whole I had printed [the entire text] with the first sheet of the Anotaciones” (p. 61). He also comments on the usefulness of his numbered lines in preparing “the transcript of my notes for the press, in which I am advanced as far as Chap.14.P.2.” (p. 60).

⁴³“Es menester mencionar esta fecha [“poco antes de Navidad del año de 1778”] porque todo lo que se escribió de Libros de Caballerías, *Poetas*, y escritores italianos, fue notado, antes que llegaron el MS de Sarmiento, y las Noticias de Pellicer” (III, p. 7). The work of Fray Martín Sarmiento, who Bowle quotes on the need for an annotated edition with special attention to romances of chivalry, remained unpublished until 1898. (*Noticia de la verdadera patria (Alcalá) de él [sic] Miguel de Cervantes*, ed. Isidro Bonsoms, Barcelona: Álvaro Verdaguer, 1898; new ed. of J[osé] [Luis] Pensado, n.p.: Xunta de Galicia, 1987).

⁴⁴In one of the copies in New York — I regret that I did not note which one it is — one can see, from the varying margins left after the conservative trim cut, how the indexes were printed in different press runs and on slightly differing paper.

⁴⁵“More than two thirds of my indexing are [sic] printed off and I am got into that of the second part” (letter to Dillon of November 18, 1779, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 76). Although he does not say so in this letter, this must be the Index of Proper Names; the word index was finished years before.

indexes were completed in late 1779,⁴⁶ and after the “Varias lecciones”,⁴⁷ Bowle turned to his notes in early 1780, putting them in final form, discarding many items,⁴⁸ adding cross-references, and keying them to the pages and line numbers of his edition of the text.

It is clear, in sum, that Bowle’s edition was not presented to the printer as a complete unit, as is our custom today, but was printed piecemeal, as its sections were completed. It appeared in 1781 because that was when Bowle completed the last sections, his notes on Part II and the prologues. In view of this, it is more understandable that some parts of the edition were distributed to purchasers unbound, as I have elsewhere pointed out;⁴⁹ different copies have the list of Errata or map bound in different places, or missing.

The material that most interests modern scholars is all in Volume III: the “oro” as Rico calls it (p. ccxlvi). Let us examine in more detail his notes and indexes, the result of “casi catorce años” (III, p. 18) of intensive work on this project. The longer and older index is that of “Palabras principales”. As early as 1767, Bowle was at work on something he became very proud of: “two most copious verbal indexes”, an endeavor, he remarked in 1772, of “more than four years”.⁵⁰ What he calls two indexes — to Part I and Part II — was originally keyed to the 1738 edition.⁵¹ As published and keyed to his line-numbered text, the word index occupies 145

⁴⁶While the verbal index was completed in 1772 (n. [50](#), below), in September of 1779 he hoped to complete “my indexes” by “next Christmas” (from a letter to Dillon of September 11, 1779, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 76).

⁴⁷Bowle outlined the sequence of his work in a letter to Dillon of June 30, 1779: “I shall go on regularly with my own work, with the Indices first, various readings, and lastly Anotaciones, Prologos, etc.” (quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 75).

⁴⁸“I have just entered upon the transcript of my Anotaciones for the press and find that I must retrench pretty largely and not cite too many instances to illustrate one single circumstance or passage” (letter to Francis Carter of February 29, 1780, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 79).

⁴⁹“Dos emisiones” (n. [25](#), above) pp. 68–70; *Los mapas del Quijote* (n. [32](#), above) p. 53. My copy has the map bound in as a fold-out; one of the Hispanic Society copies has it turned 90 degrees, trimmed so it will fit on one leaf, with no fold-out.

⁵⁰*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 99. In Percy’s letter to Bowle of April 2, 1768, he refers to the “Copiosissimo Indice”, a term he obviously got from Bowle (*Cervantine Correspondence* (n. [2](#), above) p. 13). The quote on “more than four years”: from a letter to a Rev. Mr. Warren of August 8, 1772, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 59. In a letter to Dillon of October 25, 1777, Bowle is even more precise: he began the verbal index October 11, 1767, and completed it in June of 1772 (quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* p. 69).

⁵¹“I transcribed the whole in two large quarto volumes corresponding in size to Lord Granville’s [1738] edition, to which I adapted it” (from the letter to Dillon of October 25, 1777, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 69). I do not know if this is the same as the “Vocabulario

pages of 10-point type. Bowle supplies each word's context, including a few other words to show how it was used at that point in the text. It is not an index of the notes, as many words glossed in notes are not included. It does of course include many words that *are* the subject of notes, such as *aguamanil*, *cernícalo*, or (estar en sus) *trece*, but, in addition, Bowle indexes all the words that seemed to him important, whether annotated or not: “[las] que tienen un sentido particular, o que guían al lector al conocimiento de algún hecho, o dicho, especialmente de los [sic] principales personas en esta comedia” (III, p. 356). Thus, for example, if you want to see where in *Don Quixote* Cervantes uses the word *novela*, from Bowle's index you can find that it is used in reference to the “Curioso impertinente” and to the “Novela de Rinconete y Cortadillo”. For the word “caballero” the entries total four pages of two-column text.

While it is not exhaustive and the two parts are treated separately, it is a partial concordance, and there has never been a published replacement to this day. In fact, there has never been a concordance of any sort, except for the *malogrado* and poorly-planned endeavor of Ruiz-Fornells a generation ago.⁵² Making it even more unique and valuable is the fact that Bowle lemmatized the words in his word index: that is to say, verbs are found under the infinitive, and nouns under the masculine singular form. There has never been any other attempt, published or unpublished, to create a lemmatized concordance of any work of Cervantes.⁵³ Today's online or CD indexes to the words of the text, in context, do not provide lemmas. The technology exists to do this, but it would require tagging that is well beyond the current state of the digital texts of Cervantes.

Preceding the word index, although prepared later, is Bowle's index of proper names, including of course the names of the characters, geographical names, words derived from geography such as *flamenco* and *tobosino*, and even such terms as *Galico morbo* and *[nudo] Gordiano* (both III, p. 413). Its two parts total 67 pages of 10-point text. In addition to the references to the place in which each name appears, there are words taken from the text explaining what is happening. The entry for “Camacho”, for example, is 12 lines long and has 26 entries (III, p. 410). That of Dulcinea del Toboso is two pages long (III, pp. 371–373). Both Don Quixote⁵⁴ and Sancho Panza⁵⁵ have chapter by chapter summaries, with page numbers, of their activities. Here, also, what Bowle did has never been repeated or duplicated, and a century was

cervantesco” referred to above (p. 7), or a derivative of it.

⁵²On this concordance, see my “Los textos digitales de las obras de Cervantes”, in *Cervantes 1547-1997. Jornadas de investigación cervantina*, ed. Aurelio González, Mexico City, Colegio de México, 1999, pp. 53-61. Online: <http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/cervantes/quijote_digital.pdf> and <<http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/servlet/SirveObras/33369161917648656125480/p0000001.htm>> (9 Sept. 2005).

⁵³The closest approximation, although it is not a concordance, is the *Vocabulario de Cervantes* de Carlos Fernández Gómez, Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1962.

⁵⁴III, pp. 385–392, as well as “Cosas tocantes a Don Quijote”, III, pp. 392–393.

⁵⁵III, pp. 396–401, as well as “Cosas tocantes a Sancho Panza”, III, p. 402.

to go by before the next attempt at an index, that of Bradford's 1885 index of Clemencín's notes, itself also a rarity that has just been reprinted in facsimile.⁵⁶ The next attempt at a full index was the much shorter index of Predmore, from 1938.⁵⁷

Finally, there are his "Anotaciones" that Bowle, using Cervantine terminology whenever he can, also calls his "Comento." The notes occupy 324 pages, again in 10-point type. Their primary goal is to elucidate the proper names and the words that a reader would need a definition for, and took as point of departure all the books mentioned in the text. Beginning in 1769 with *Amadís de Gaula* (III, p. 7), Bowle read as many of these as he could obtain, and he went to considerable trouble to locate and purchase or borrow them; I'd like to read you Bowle's list, published in his *Letter to Dr. Percy* four years prior to his edition, of the "romances" that he had used, as of that date, to "illustrate" the text of *Don Quixote*. More than half of these are mentioned in the work:

A List of the ROMANCES which have in numerous instances illustrated the text of DON QUIXOTE.

Muchas, y muy graves Historias he yo leido de Cavalleros Andantes.
D.Q. P. I. C. 47.

Girone il Cortese de Luigi Alemanni
Amadis de Gaula, L[ibros] 4. T[omos] 2. *Lovayna* . 1551. 8vo.
Amadis de Grecia. en Lisboa. 1596. F[olio].
Orlando Furioso di Ariosto.
Don Quixote por Avellaneda. en *Madrid*. 1732. 4 [quarto].
Angelica por Luis Barahona de Soto. en *Granada*. 1586. 4.
Don Belianis de Grecia, 3 & 4 partes. *Burgos*. 1597 F.⁵⁸
Hazañas de Bernardo del Carpio. en Toledo. 1585. 4.
Orlando Innamorato di Boiardo.
Innamoramiento [sic] del Re Carlo. In *Venetia* [sic], 1556. 8vo.
Las Sergas de Esplandian. en *Zaragoza*. 1587. F.

⁵⁶Carlos F. Bradford, *Índice de las notas de D. Diego Clemencín en su edición de El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*, Madrid, 1885, facsimile with new introduction by Santiago Riopérez y Milá, Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2005.

⁵⁷Richard L. Predmore, *An Index to Don Quixote, including Proper Names and Notable Matters*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1938; rpt. New York: Kraus, 1970. I have found especially useful the "Índice analítico" of José Bergúa, in the humble *Sepan Cuantos* series, 10th edition, Mexico City: Porrúa, 1969.

⁵⁸Bowle was never able to locate a copy of the first two parts of *Belianís de Grecia*. On the importance of this book for Cervantes, see Howard Mancing, "'Bendito sea Alá': A New Edition of *Belianís de Grecia*", *Cervantes* XXI, 2 (2001), pp. 111–115 (online: <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/articf01/mancing.pdf>>, 23 April 2006).

Espejo de Cavallerias. *Medina del Campo*. 1586. F.
 Segunda parte de Orlando. por Nicolas Espinosa. en *Anvers*. 1556. 4to.
 Cavallero del Febo. T[omo]s. 3. *Alcala*. 1580. *Zaragoza*. 1623. F.⁵⁹
 Felix Marte de Yrcania. en *Valladolid*. 1557. Fol.
 Olivante de Laura. en *Barcelona*. 1564. F.
 Palmerin de Oliva. en *Toledo*. 1580. F.
 Don Polindo. en *Toledo*. 1526. F.
 Los tres Libros de Primaleon. en *Venecia*. 1534. F.
 Il Morgante Maggiore di Pulci.
 Tirante el Blanco. en *Valladolid*. 1511. F.
 La Hermosura de Angelica. por Lope de Vega. en *Barcelona*. 1604.⁶⁰

Today we would not use the label “romances” for all of these works; Bowle’s generic concepts are not ours, just as Cervantes’ are not either. However, no one today has read or even skimmed all of these books. Bowle came closer to replicating Cervantes’ reading than anyone ever has and, I believe, than anyone ever will.

When questions remained unanswered after perusing those books mentioned in the text, he looked for others, as he explained in his *Letter to Dr. Percy*. An example is the *Cancionero de romances* of Antwerp, 1555, which provided him the *romances* he sought on the Marqués de Mantua (III, pp. 52–53), “Media noche era por filo” (III, p. 209), “Mala la huvistes Franceses en esa de Roncesvalles” (III, p. 210), and “el Romance de Calainos” (III, p. 210).

Covarrubias, who is the single author most frequently quoted by Bowle, he read from cover to cover, from *a* to *z* (something that I wish I had the time to do). Bowle tells the reader that “La ingratitud vengada” is a play of Lope and *La Numancia* an unpublished play of Cervantes (III, p. 171). He tells the reader who Barbarroja was (III, p. 152). Who were Amadís de Gaula, Belianís de Grecia, Olivante de Laura, and Tirante el Blanco? What is meant by *farándula* (III, p. 215), and what does it mean to be compared with a Fúcar (III, p. 249)? Where was Casildea de Vandalia from (III, p. 221)? And so on. Bowle is meticulous about giving sources, and never fails to point out a cross-reference when possible (as he says at III, p. 9), using his “copiosísimo índice” for that purpose.

Bowle’s edition does have limitations. It would of course have been more convenient if notes had been placed at the foot of pages, as Samuel Johnson pointed out to Bowle, but this was

⁵⁹What this apparently indicates is that Bowle had Part 1 of the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros* or *Caballero del Febo*, consisting of three books (1580), and Parts 3-4 (1623), but not Part 2, although also published in 1580. See Daniel Eisenberg and M.^a Carmen Marín Pina, *Bibliografía de los libros de caballerías castellanos*, Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2000, pp. 323–331 (online: <http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/Bibl_libros_de_caballerias/bibliography.pdf>, 6 April 2006).

⁶⁰*A Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 145.

not practical for him.⁶¹ The lack of pagination of the indexes and the double pagination of the notes (the notes to Part II start over with page 1) are confusing, though now remedied in the Juan de la Cuesta facsimile. It would have been better to have a single word index and a single name index, instead of separate indexes to each part, and then, for the proper names only, a third index telling in which part each name is treated.⁶² Bowle includes a table of contents for the chapters of Part II, but not of Part I. He assumes the reader will not have a Spanish or Spanish-English dictionary, and gives definitions for words like *avellana*, *encina*, *gala*, *desmochar*, and *traducir* that seem superfluous.⁶³ When “Rinconete y Cortadillo” is mentioned in Chapter 47 of Part I, one cannot but wonder why Bowle, so fond of cross-references, and who evidently read the *novela* (III, p. 186), does not tell his fellow readers that Cervantes published it in his *Novelas ejemplares*. Strangely, although Bowle cites all of Cervantes’ published books in one or another of his notes, despite his veneration of Cervantes he seems to have had no interest in these other works, and this despite Cervantes’ report of his friends’ opinion that his *Trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda* “ha de llegar al extremo de bondad posible” (*Don Quixote*, II, Dedication).⁶⁴

Despite these shortcomings, Bowle’s notes were used extensively by the next major editors, Pellicer and Clemencín, and were of course available to Rodríguez Marín and other nineteenth- and twentieth-century editors. There are few unexploited nuggets of information in

⁶¹The comment of Johnson: from Bowle’s letter to Percy of July 28, 1780, in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. 2, above), pp. 59–62, on p. 61. Presumably it was not practical for Bowle because he needed a line-numbered text in advance of, and to make possible, his indexes of words and proper names, and through the latter include frequent cross-references in the notes. As he expresses it in the same letter, “Many uses have arisen to myself, & of course to my future readers from the numbering of the lines of the pages: Hence I have been enabled to prefer one place to another, & with more precision & propriety agreeable to the Authors poner *Las Anotaciones y Acotaciones*” (p. 60).

⁶²This presumably reflects Bowle’s method of indexing. Like Nicolás Antonio, he did not use a card system; cards did not come into general use until the nineteenth century, with mechanized paper cutters. Rather he made his index entries on the pages of blank books. Having completed Part I, to begin Part II in a fresh book, with empty pages, would seem more attractive than it would to someone using a card system.

⁶³This is the “Glossary” promised in the *Letter to Dr. Percy* and *Prospectus*: not a separate alphabetical listing of words, but annotations giving the meaning of possibly unfamiliar words. “The several words explained, which constitute the glossary, will be found in their respective places among the annotations, and where any one is frequently used, it may be easily found in the general indexes; specimens of which are here annexed” (*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. 10, above) p. 140).

⁶⁴After publication of the edition, Bowle wrote to Dillon on February 4, 1782 stating that the *Viaje del Parnaso* entitles Cervantes “to a distinguished seat as a first rate poet among his countrymen” (quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 91). This is the only comment by Bowle on any other work of Cervantes.

them. The notes and indexes are not very convenient for casual consultation; in the Juan de la Cuesta facsimile, at my suggestion, page numbers, running heads, and a table of contents have been added to the volume with notes and indexes. If one studies Bowle's notes, however, one is repeatedly struck by how much later editors owe to him. This is especially surprising because, of course, these commentators do not acknowledge the extent of their debt to Bowle, and mention him most frequently to criticize him.⁶⁵ The first editor to recognize his true contribution is Francisco Rico: "Nos faltan palabras para alabar la tarea de don Juan (como gustaba llamarse...),⁶⁶ la documentación, amplitud, exigencia, acierto y sobriedad de su comentario: con que nos contentaremos con decir que se halla en la raíz de todos los posteriores y que son abundantes las glosas que ningún cervantista parece haber querido llevar más allá de donde las dejó Bowle" (p. ccxlviii).

It is not just from later editors that Bowle received unfair treatment from Spaniards. The preparation of the Royal Academy's edition of 1780, which of course has neither explanatory notes, indexes, nor line numbers, dates back at least to 1773, the date of the king's license, which was included in the edition. Although it has been the subject of two studies, by Cotarelo and González Palencia,⁶⁷ we do not know in detail the chronology of its preparation. We do know that people such as Pellicer the royal librarian, Tomás López the royal geographer, Casimiro Gómez Ortega, director of the Real Jardín Botánico, and the bookseller Antonio de Sancha were aware of Bowle's project either through personal contact — Bowle met Ortega in London and said he spent the most enjoyable day of his life with him (III, p. 17) — or through his *Letter to Dr. Percy* and subsequent *Prospectus*. Hilton has speculated that the stimulus of Bowle's project moved the Academy to get their edition out when they did: *first*, so that the national pride, already wounded by the London, 1738, edition, would not be insulted a second time by another landmark English edition.⁶⁸ One can see in the Academy edition how they were concerned that

⁶⁵"Pellicer...añadió notas en que a veces disfrutó más de lo justo el trabajo de Bowle, sin nombrarle" (Clemencín (n. [9](#), above) p. 998). Clemencín's combination of praise for and criticism of Bowle was quoted above, in the same note.

⁶⁶Ellipsis in the original. Actually he was called "don Bowle" by his friends; I have not found any other reference to his using the name, or being referred to as, "don Juan". "[S]i ses amis l'appelait 'Don Bowle' (et prouvaient ainsi leur méconnaissance de l'usage espagnol), c'était tout simplement à cause de ses études de *Don Quichotte* (où l'usage de 'don' est aussi un peu étrange)" (Hilton (n. [32](#), above) Chapter 6; italics added to *Don Quichotte*).

⁶⁷Ángel González Palencia, *Las ediciones académicas del Quijote*, Madrid: n.p. ["Sección de Cultura e Información, Artes Gráficas Municipales"], 1947, and Armando Cotarelo Valledor, *El Quijote académico, oración inaugural del curso 1947–48 leída ante el Instituto de España en la sesión pública celebrada el día 25 de octubre de 1947 en la Real Academia Española y de su orden*, Madrid: n.p., 1948.

⁶⁸"La gran edición de Lord Carteret [de 1738] era una espina clavada en los ánimos más lúcidos. Quien primero procuró quitársela parece haber sido el Marqués de la Ensenada, que en 1752 proyectaba reeditar el *Quijote* 'de forma que en la letra, papel, láminas y demás circunstancias de

“todo lo necesario para ella se trabajase dentro de España, y por artífices Españoles”.⁶⁹ It did contain a lengthy “Análisis del *Quijote*” by Vicente de los Ríos, which Bowle praised highly,⁷⁰ a biography of Cervantes which went into more depth than that of Mayans, and a few new biographical documents. But beyond that, what were given a lot of attention and money were the illustrations, the newly-cast type that was created especially for this project, the high-quality paper: things that added greatly to the cost, but advanced our understanding of the work very little. Of this edition there have been no less than five facsimiles: in 1977, 1985, 1994, 2004, and 2005, with the claim accompanying the 2004 reprint that it was “el primer *Quijote* moderno”, although the sense in which it was a modern edition is not stated.⁷¹ Juan de la Cuesta has just published the first facsimile of Bowle’s edition. It is similarly revealing that one of the first two Spanish studies of Bowle, of 2005, has as a principal goal to establish how much later Spanish editors did *not* take from him.⁷²

la impresión no ceda a la de Londres, y aun aventaje si fuera posible’, saliendo también ‘más correcta y confirme al original’. El proyecto naufragó con Ensenada, y tampoco llegaron a buen puerto otros connatos de alzar el libro a un nivel superior al de las divulgadísimas ediciones ‘de surtido’. El doble objetivo sólo se cumplió eficazmente cuando más de veinte años después la Real Academia Española se resolvió a ‘hacer una impresión correcta y magnífica del Don Quijote’, que vio la luz en 1780.

“Los académicos comenzaron y concluyeron la tarea en competencia con dos ediciones inglesas: confesadamente, ‘la costosa y magnífica hecha en Londres’; a las calladas, la que John Bowle preparaba”. (Francisco Rico, “Clásico, nacional, centenario”, en *Quijotismos* (Aldeamayor de San Martín: Papeles de la Biblioteca Municipal, 2005), pp. 11–38, the quotation on pp. 16–17. According to a note at the end of the book (p. 87), this essay was “publicado como introducción a *Lecturas españolas del Quijote*, selección de J. Montero Reguera, prólogo de J. M. Barreda, [Toledo], Junta de Castilla–La Mancha, 2005, págs. 13–36. Pero el primer apartado (‘De cómo el *Quijote* llegó a ser un clásico, también en España’) había salido previamente en *El País* (suplemento *Babelia*, núm. 700), 23 de abril de 2005.”)

⁶⁹P. vii, quoted by Hilton in Chapter 6, “Le Cervantisme Anglais au 18eme Siècle”, of his *La Légende noire au 18e siècle: Le monde hispanique vu du dehors* (n. [32](#), above).

⁷⁰“En quanto al Analisis del Quixote se puede decir, que es la mas fina Critica, que ha parecido desde el tiempo de nuestro Addison; y que es en su modo superior á qualquiera de Francia. Leo y releola con gusto infinito. Pesa me mucho, que no puedo en todo convenir con la [sic]” (letter to Pellicer, Aug. 12, 1784, in “Correspondence” (n. [11](#), above) pp. 133–135, the quote on p. 134.

⁷¹<http://www.educa.aragob.es/ryc/quijote_web/el_primer_quijote_moderno.htm> (14 Sept. 2005). For details about the other reprints, see my introduction to the facsimile of Bowle’s edition, I, pp. 3–31, at p. 8 n. 22.

⁷²This article, by Diego Martínez Torrón, is cited in n. [4](#), above. The other article, published in the same volume, is the first Spanish defense of Bowle, but it is a defense of him against the attacks of Baretto: Rafael Martínez Carretero, “Apuntes para una vindicación del Reverendo John

The Academy's edition did offer what for the day was a clean text, as Rico says (p. ccxlvii), but it was a commemorative edition, prepared for patriotic and emotional rather than scholarly reasons. I quote from Enrique Rodríguez Cepeda: "el *Quijote* nunca se ha leído, salvo raras veces, en la edición de Ibarra de 1780... Esta edición pesa, no es manejable y fue pensada, como regalo aristocrático y protegido que fue, para manejo de políticos, administración y Gobierno... En esta edición no se ha leído el *Quijote*".⁷³ Its text was soon reprinted in more "manejable" editions, in 1782 and 1787, but the 1780 Academy edition was intended to advance Spain and Spaniards, not Cervantes. It was not an edition for reading, and if an edition is not for reading, what is it for? Whereas Bowle's edition, without plates and scarcely any ornament or distraction after the title page, was, first and foremost, a reader's edition.⁷⁴

It is disappointing but unsurprising that the Academy makes no printed reference to Bowle's project, even though the idea of including a map, and perhaps textual notes as well, came from Bowle's *Letter to Dr. Percy*. But it is particularly offensive to me that not one of his Spanish correspondents informed Bowle that an important edition was being prepared in Spain.⁷⁵ After it was published, in 1780, no one sent him a copy; no one, not even the bookseller Sancha who had four copies of Bowle's edition to sell, even told him that a major, new edition had just appeared, so that he could buy a copy.⁷⁶ Years went by until Bowle learned of and received the

Bowle M.A., F.S.A., frente a los cargos vertidos contra él por Mr. Giuseppe Baretti", in *Cervantes y el ámbito anglosajón*, ed. Diego Martínez Torrón and Bernd Dietz, Madrid: Sial, 2005, pp. 13–62.

⁷³Enrique Rodríguez-Cepeda, "Los *Quijotes* del siglo XVIII. 1) La imprenta de Manuel Martín", *Cervantes VIII*, 1 (1988), pp. 61–104, at p. 63. Online: <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/artics88/rodrigue.htm>> (15 Sept. 2005).

⁷⁴"[E]n la disposición de las Anotaciones un principal intento ha sido aliviar el trabajo del Lector, aclarando las dificultades del texto sin divertir su atención, sino quando sea necesario" (III, p. 360). Bowle discusses his title page in a letter to Dillon of March 22, 1781 (Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 84). On Bowle's two sets of title pages, see Eisenberg, "Dos emisiones" (n. 25, above) pp. 55–58.

⁷⁵While the topic does not come up in his correspondence with Pellicer or Sancha, he had gotten some knowledge of it. On March 31, 1778, he wrote to Dillon, "The Royal Academy may give finer paper, plates, and print than any other can afford, but without a due use of this [1608] edition their text cannot be compleat" (quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 71). This information may have come from his meeting with the traveling botanist Casimiro Gómez Ortega in London, which must be prior to his reference to it in a letter to Percy of February 10, 1777 (*Cervantine Correspondence* (n. 2, above) p. 46).

⁷⁶The fate of these four copies is unknown. Dillon subscribed to the edition at Sancha's shop, saying that he desired "as a lover of Spanish to be put on the list amongst the Spanish subscribing and with my foreign titles in the Spanish language thus". He added, "I am persuaded from what I have heard, many Spaniards will purchase your book when it appears, but it is too

Academy's edition.⁷⁷ One of Bowle's most virtuous moments, and he would be very pleased to hear me apply that adjective to him, is the lengthy letter he wrote for *Gentleman's Magazine* informing the readers of and praising the Academy edition, one that was in competition with his own and arguably depriving him of sales.⁷⁸

Although there were hints of problems before, with the publication of his edition in 1781 things go downhill for Bowle. But before proceeding, let us review his contributions. Here are Bowle's "firsts":

1. He was the first to number the lines of the work. I have not looked at every intervening edition, but to my knowledge the next edition with line numbers was Rodríguez Marín's Clásicos La Lectura, later Clásicos Castellanos edition, of 1911–13.
2. Bowle's notes, keyed to line numbers, are by far the most extensive in any language up to that point. His is the first comprehensive annotation.⁷⁹
3. He is the first to provide indexes of words and proper names, "completísimos" in the opinion of Rico (p. ccxlix).
4. He was the first to make a map of Don Quixote's Spain.⁸⁰
5. Bowle was the first to call attention to the importance of the *tasas* and *licencias*. "The licences, approbations, and censures should be...retained, as they contain many curious particulars respecting the history of the work itself not elsewhere to be had"⁸¹
6. Bowle also deserves credit for restoring the dedications, which were omitted in prior eighteenth-century editions.
7. Bowle is the first to examine *Don Quixote* from the perspective of a textual scholar. This

dear for common sale and Subscriptions is a thing they are not accustomed to" (Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 72). Bowle clearly wanted his edition to "be admissible into Spain, which for many reasons Lord Carterets could not" (letter to Percy of February 10, 1777, in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. 2, above) p. 46). In his list of subscribers (III, pp. 355–357), the four copies are listed as a subscription by Sancha, in addition to copies for the Real Academia de la Historia, Pedro Rodríguez Campomanes, and Bowle's acquaintance Casimiro Gómez Ortega and correspondent Tomás López the geographer.

⁷⁷"Jamás vi su grande [sic] Edición hasta el mes de Octubre pasado" (letter to Pellicer of August 12, 1784; "Correspondence" (n. 11, above) p. 134). However, in a letter to Dillon of June 4, 1782, he says that "The Madrid Edition of Quixote by the Academia is magnificent indeed" (Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. 3, above) p. 92).

⁷⁸"Correspondence" (n. 11, above) pp. 127–129.

⁷⁹Some of his notes have notes of their own, i.e. notes on the notes (III, pp. 27, 97, and 210).

⁸⁰See *Los mapas del Quijote*, cited in n. 32, above.

⁸¹*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. 10, above) p. 120. Strangely, these were omitted in his edition.

includes the first discussion of the textual deficiencies of existing editions.⁸² He points out for the first time the need to go back to Cuesta's 1605 and 1615 editions. He was the first to note that there were two editions printed by Cuesta in 1605, although he only had access to the second of them. He was also the first to call attention to the 1608 edition, pointing out the special value of editions made during an author's lifetime, to which he could have contributed.⁸³ He is the first to completely collate previous editions, four of Part I and 3 of Part II, publishing the variants in parallel columns under the heading "Varias lecciones" (III, pp. 578–592). While he made only one major textual correction — changing "el valiente Detriante" to "el valiente de Tirante" in chapter 6 of Part I — he identified textual problems which would be studied by editors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁸⁴

8. He is the first to note that Sancho makes linguistic errors, which the editor and typesetter

⁸²Bowle's comments are exclusively on the shortcomings of the editor Pineda, who prepared the text of the then-authoritative 1738 edition. See *A Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) pp. 116–119 and 139–140, and the quotation from the index of the *Letter*, quoted at the end of n. [30](#), above. Bowle also criticizes Pineda for having reprinted Lo Frasso's "disparatado" *Fortuna de amor* and for having taken straightforwardly the ironic praise of it in Part I, Chapter 6 (*Letter to Dr. Percy*, pp. 116–117 and 131–132).

⁸³*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 122; letter to Percy of August 17, 1778, in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. [2](#), above) p. 54. Bowle was able to use a copy of the 1608 edition only after publication of the *Letter* in 1777: "Un Gentilhombre, que jamás vi, que vive más de 300 millas de mi casa, muy zeloso para la honra de Cervantes, el Ciudadano de todo el mundo, me prestó la de 1608. Ésta fue corregida, acaso por el mismo; hállanse en él algunas omisiones, el efecto de mucho juicio". (From a letter to Pellicer of August 12, 1784, in "Correspondence" (n. [11](#), above) pp. 133–135, the quote on p. 135). The person who lent him the 1608 edition was Edward Collingswood (Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 73); in a letter to Dillon of October 25, 1777, he wrote "A gentleman of the north of England quite unknown to me brought this with him to London last spring solely for my use" (quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* p. 69). In contrast with the "acaso" in the letter to Pellicer of 1784, when writing to him in 1779 he said "Tengo para mi que Esta de 1608 fue corregida, y revisada por el Autor" ("Correspondence" p. 121; this letter never reached Pellicer, as Bowle notes in his second letter to him, "Correspondence" p. 133). When writing to Collingswood, apparently on the occasion of returning the copy to him in November of 1778, Bowle said: "I have no doubt but that it was corrected by the author himself. I am led to this inference from the several variations of the text which I have made from its authority. And they consist not only in some material additions but judicious defalcations from the first Madrid edition in 1605 which I possess and which I propose to point out. I have printed entirely from your copy and have strictly adhered to it where a better reading was not warranted by the other two editions". (Quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* pp. 73–74; similarly in a letter to Dillon of October 25, 1777, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* p. 69).

⁸⁴For more information, see my introduction to the facsimile (n. [8](#), above) I, pp. 21–22.

- should not correct.⁸⁵
9. As the first scholar of the work, he is the first to systematically use translations — both English and Italian — to better understand difficult points in the text.⁸⁶
 10. He was the first to praise Cervantes' style: "The style of Cervantes merits every encomium. It may be compared to the noblest river, that now rapid runs with proper velocity, now gently glides along, and suffers its crystal current to be tinged with hues, which it receives from the lesser streams that mingle with its waters. To drop the allusion, the language of *Don Quixote*, tho' the purest and most elegant of the Castilian, has its variations and inequalities, conformable to the persons in whose mouths it is put and to the subjects treated of."⁸⁷
 11. He was the first to say that in some aspects, Cervantes' text cannot be translated.⁸⁸
 12. Bowle was also the first to say that Cervantes' Part II was much superior to that of Avellaneda. In the eighteenth century, in both Spain and France influential figures held Avellaneda's continuation to be superior to that of Cervantes, and it was reprinted for the first time since 1614, and translated into French. In Spain Blas Antonio de Nasarre, Mayans' predecessor as royal librarian, held this position.
 13. He is the first to list by chapter, in the "Índice de Nombres Propios", Don Quixote's activities and those of Sancho.⁸⁹
 14. He is the first to recognize that Rocinante and the Rucio are characters of the work. Their activities are also detailed in his "Índice de Nombres Propios" (III, pp. 394–396).
 15. He is the first to provide a list of verse in *Don Quixote*: "Sonetos en Q[uixote]" (III, pp. 492 and 569).
 16. He is the first to identify the *refranes* used in the book, locating them in contemporary *refraneros*.
 17. He is the first to speak of constantly finding new "pleasures" in the work upon rereading.⁹⁰

⁸⁵My introduction to the edition (n. [8](#), above) I, p. 11.

⁸⁶These are the translations of Franciosini and Shelton, cited on III, pp. 580 and 584. Other places where Franciosini is used are listed in the index of Autores citados, III, p. 21.

⁸⁷*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 123.

⁸⁸"In what is past I have all along insisted on a correct text. This naturally requires an explanation of difficult passages, which makes a principal part of the notes, and these, besides pointing out the historical and other references, will in various places show a propriety in the original absolutely untransferable into any other language." (*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above), p. 139).

⁸⁹See notes [54](#) and [55](#), above.

⁹⁰"...my love and veneration for this author, whose every new reading brings new pleasure, and discovers latent beauties that have eluded my former surveys" (*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 130).

18. He is the first to speak of the work's irony.⁹¹
19. Bowle was the first to claim that Cervantes was an equal to Shakespeare (*Letter to Dr. Percy* p. 116), adding in a private letter that "I defy all mankind to find a third worthy to be named with these two".⁹²
20. He was the first to note that Shakespeare and Cervantes died on the same day, pointing out at the same time the difference in calendars between Spain and England.⁹³
21. Bowle was the first to claim that Cervantes was a classic author, in the same class as the great authors of antiquity (*Letter to Dr. Percy* p. 98).
22. Bowle is the first to say that he is more than a Spanish author, that he is an honor to the entire human race.⁹⁴

At the time his edition appeared, Bowle was on top of the world, happy and proud. He felt he had carried out a worthy endeavor, one that in some way was reserved for him. All his "drudgery" and "pains",⁹⁵ his "six hours at least daily" of work,⁹⁶ were worthwhile: he had

⁹¹*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 131. As early as 1774, in a letter to Percy he wrote of the work's "Grave & Serious Irony" which "every where occurs" in the work (*Cervantine Correspondence* (n. [2](#), above) p. 34). Cox erroneously identifies this letter as addressed to a John Ives (*Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 63).

⁹²Letter to the Spanish consul Miguel de Ventades, May 20, 1777, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 68.

⁹³III, p. 13; also *Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 123. José María González de Mendoza is mistaken when he says that Bowle was unaware of the difference in calendars. ("Discrepancias en torno a la muerte de Cervantes", in his *Ensayos selectos*, <<http://www.tablada.unam.mx/poesia/ensayos/discrep.html>>, 19 abril 2006.)

⁹⁴"...Honor y Gloria, no solamente de su Patria, pero de todo el Género Humano" (III, p. 32)

⁹⁵For Bowle, who wholeheartedly endorsed Cervantes' goal to end romances of chivalry, the "painful reading" of them was "drudgery" (*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) pp. 99 and 130–131). But he speaks often of the amount of effort all the pieces of his project required: "uncommon labour and perseverance" (*Letter to Dr. Percy* p. 129), "Herculean labours" (n. [21](#), above), and the like. The verbal index, 700 pages in manuscript (letter to Percy of July 28, 1772, in *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. [2](#), above) p. 26), took "two whole years of my life eight hours per day" (letter to Dillon of October 25, 1777, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 69); it too was drudgery (letter to John Ives of March 31, 1774, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* p. 63). When working on the index of proper names he had to be "steeled with seven-fold patience, and endued with a larger portion of perseverance" (*Letter to Dr. Percy* p. 130); "mucho tiempo, gran paciencia, e incansable perseverancia son indispensables requisitos para tales obras" (III, p. 360). In the preparation of his "Varias lecciones" (collation of editions), "la suma diligencia" was necessary (III, p. 360). It is not for nothing that he chose for his bookplate the *refrán* "Alcanza quien no cansa". Bowle felt that he deserved praise for his effort, and the expectation of this

identified and made accessible a new classic, *Don Quixote*. He expected acclaim for what he had accomplished: “a work of such magnitude as will reflect infinite honour on the erudition and taste of the ingenious editor; how singular a pleasure to the admirers of Cervantes in general!”, was a pre-publication comment of a collaborator.⁹⁷ He believed, from a naive reading of the



John Bowle’s bookplate. The *refrán* is from Hernán Núñez and is quoted in Bowle’s edition at the end of his indexes, III, p. 577. From the copy of Tonson’s 1738 edition of *Don Quixote* in the Bowle-Evans Collection, University of Cape Town; this is the only printed book owned by Bowle in their collection. (Thanks to Tanya Barben.)

letters he received from Spain, that Spaniards recognized and celebrated his contribution.⁹⁸ “No

praise is a factor he relied on to stay motivated.

⁹⁶Letter to Dillon of September 11, 1779, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 76.

⁹⁷In the *Travels through Spain*, 1780, of Bowle’s collaborator John Talbot Dillon, quoted in Chapter 6 of Hilton (n. [32](#), above).

⁹⁸“Malheureusement le bon Bowle a avalé tous ces compliments comme de l’eau claire. La pierre de touche, ce seront les commentaires, que nous citerons plus tard, qui n’ont pas été

one can understand Cervantes fully that does not come to my school”, he remarks confidently to Percy in his letter of July 28, 1780.⁹⁹ By this he means that for a full understanding of the text, readers will have to use his *Comento*.

From that point on things did not go well, and this is why the issue of *Cervantes* with a cluster of material on Bowle is titled “The Tragedy of John Bowle”.¹⁰⁰ From Spain he was criticized for errors in his notes, errata in the text, and for mentioning Pellicer and López Ortega in his acknowledgments.¹⁰¹ There were no reviews of his edition, either in England or Spain. This troubled Bowle and he protested in 1784, in a letter to *Gentleman’s Magazine*: “As I have

adressés a Bowle, et où l’hypocrisie de la politesse n’a pas rendu nécessaires les éloges”.
 ...“Nous soupçonnons qu’Ortega, de même que Pellicer dans sa lettre à Bowle, parle avec une hypocrisie consciente ou inconsciente. Les Espagnols se croyaient obligés de louer la tâche de Bowle, surtout en s’adressant à lui, mais en réalité ils en étaient jaloux. Comment l’Academia Espagnole pouvait-elle être enthousiasmée, comme l’affirme Ortega, par la publication en Angleterre d’une belle édition du Quichotte qui paraîtrait presque en même temps que la sienne, la première entreprise par l’Académie Espagnole, et qui lui serait supérieure? Becker prétend, peut-être avec raison, que la jalousie poussa l’Académie à précipiter la publication de son édition, qui parut enfin quelques mois avant celle de Bowle. Enfin, Ortega affirme qu’il a fait réviser la carte d’Espagne par le meilleur géographe espagnol, c’est à dire, selon Bowle, par Tomás López. Or, malgré cette révision, des endroits fort connus, comme l’Alcarria, Baeza, Úbeda, Elche, etc., sont restés dans des emplacements fantastiques. Il faut en conclure que López, jaloux de la science anglaise, a renvoyé la carte avec des corrections fort sommaires, en disant, plus ou moins conscient du mensonge, que tout y était bien maintenant.” These quotations are from Chapter 6 of Hilton (n. [32](#), above).

⁹⁹*Cervantine Correspondence* (n. [2](#), above) p. 60.

¹⁰⁰Volume XXIII, 2. Online: <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/bcsaf03.htm>> (3 Aug. 2005).

¹⁰¹Whether transmitted orally or in writing, these comments came via Gabriel de Sancha, on a visit to England. They are known from Bowle’s reply to Pellicer of August 12, 1784, which Sancha took back to Spain: “En lo que he dicho en mis notas, que no corresponde con sus pensamientos, espero que tendran los Academicos la bondad de creer, que jamas vi su grande Edicion hasta el mes de Octubre pasado: y que perdonasenme el aver pensado con el grande Autor de la Historia que los Cavalleros Andantes no tuvieron camino determinado, y que el tiempo de la Accion avia de ser computado de los años del Ama. No fue mi intencion ofender ni a vmd, ni a Don Casimiro de Ortega: espero que miraran entrambos la libertad que tomava con sus nombres, como un testimonio de mi estima y respeto. Yo me fio de la generosidad de la Nacion Española; que asentavan los errores de la estampa, y advertirán, que no tuve alguna ayuda en el corregir la obra del Impresor, totalmente ignorante del lenguaje. Ruego a Vmd ser servido de asegurar a todos, que no he aseverado [?] ninguna cosa que pensava ofendiera ó las leyes, ó la Religion de España: con sumo cuidado he tantado [sic] de evitar todo eso. Que mis notas encuentran la aprobacion de Vmd es a mi un sumo placer.” (“Correspondence” (n. [11](#), above, pp. 133–135, the quote on p. 134).

within a few days past discovered some very unfair practices respecting the admission of an account of my edition of Don Quixote into two periodical publications, to which I had some reason to think I was entitled, and have found the perpetrators of them to have been a false friend, and another, whose encomium I should regard as an affront and real slander; the one as fond of the grossest flattery, as the other ready to give it, and both alike wholesale dealers in abuse and detraction”.¹⁰²

These two individuals were Joseph Baretta and John Crookshanks. The latter had helped Bowle in preparing his edition; Cox, who has read their unpublished correspondence, says that Bowle “relies on Crookshanks’ judgment and outright assistance with books and manuscripts”.¹⁰³ After Percy and Dillon, Crookshanks is the person who helped him the most. He cautioned Bowle before publication that his errors in Spanish were so serious that they would “damn his edition”.¹⁰⁴ At this Bowle took profound offense, broke off the relationship, and omitted him in his acknowledgments, at which Crookshanks was understandably offended. Baretta had been insulted by Bowle with a description, in his *Letter to Dr. Percy*, of Baretta’s account of Spanish literature as “egregiously defective and erroneous”.¹⁰⁵

Even though it is always intelligible, Bowle’s Spanish is embarrassing, as Baretta would soon say publicly.¹⁰⁶ My colleague Anthony Close, who easily forgives mistakes by English scholars of Cervantes, says that Bowle’s notes were in “good self-taught Spanish”.¹⁰⁷ I beg to disagree. No one can call the following “good Spanish”:

“Como en la disposición de las Anotaciones un principal intento ha sido aliviar el trabajo del Lector, aclarando las dificultades del texto sin divertir su atención, sino cuando sea

¹⁰²“Correspondence” (n. [11](#), above) pp. 136–138.

¹⁰³*Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 65.

¹⁰⁴Quoted by Baretta, *Tolondron* (n. [7](#), above) pp. 238–239. Bowle confirms this in his nearly-inaccessible *Remarks on the Extraordinary Conduct of the Knight of the Ten Stars and his Italian Esquire* (n. [116](#), below): “From my outset to the exhibition of my *Prologo* to him, as far as I can recollect, I had his concurrence. On shewing him this, when set up for revisal, the weather-cock of his opinion veer’d about, and he at once told me *it* would damn my whole work: on mentioning to him an honourable person’s speaking of it in terms of approbation, he turn’d a deaf ear. Had he said, if it stands as it now does, *I* will damn your whole work, he had spoke out, and more to the purpose” (p. 2).

¹⁰⁵*Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 114. R[onald] W. Truman describes this as a “gratuitously offensive remark” in “The Rev. John Bowle’s Quixotic Woes Further Explored”, *Cervantes* XXIII, 2 (2003), pp. 9–43, at p. 22. Online: <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/articf03/truman.pdf>> (15 Sept. 2005).

¹⁰⁶Bowle’s Spanish is studied by Martínez Carretero, cited in n. [72](#), above.

¹⁰⁷*The Romantic Approach to Don Quixote*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978, p. 10.

necesario *recorrer a las*, el mismo *ha sido seguido en formando* los indices, donde *hallaránse* los dichos del Prevaricador Sancho...”¹⁰⁸

Unfortunately Pellicer was correct when he said that Bowle’s Spanish “se resiente, como es natural, de no pocos barbarismos y frases extrañas”.¹⁰⁹ On the title page alone there are two serious errors: he writes “primero tomo” and translates “copies may be had”, or something similar, with “se hallarán”, there being no subject for the Spanish plural verb.¹¹⁰ Bowle commits numerous other grammatical errors, including errors in agreement such as “esto manuscrito” and “cuatros libros,” and using “pero” when “sino” is called for¹¹¹; he writes Anglicisms such as “tomar la pena” and “en la mañana”; he puts clitics on the end of verb forms where they cannot go,¹¹² he uses archaisms he has learned from his reading, such as “ca”, “oviere”, and “Ingalaterra”, without realizing that they are not in current use. Despite his proclamation of respect for Cervantes’ orthography, in his edition the orthography and use of accents are quite confused, as Baretto points out with glee in “Speech the Ninth” of *Tolondron*.¹¹³ This is the biggest shortcoming of Bowle’s edition. It’s like the job applicant with numerous stains on his or her shirt: perhaps irrelevant to the job, but creating a very bad impression.¹¹⁴

With the exception of my English colleague, everyone who looks at Bowle’s edition

¹⁰⁸III, p. 360, emphasis added; orthography modernized.

¹⁰⁹“Discurso preliminar” p. xvi, cited by Hilton (n. [32](#), above) Chapter 6, n. 119.

¹¹⁰The title pages of the two emissions of his edition are reproduced in Eisenberg, “Dos emisiones” (n. [25](#), above) pp. 62–63.

¹¹¹“...honor y gloria no solamente de su patria, pero de todo el género humano” (III, p. 32).

¹¹²For example: “pocos verbos hállanse” (III, p. 360); “Bautizóse a 9 de Octubre” (III, p. 10), which also misuses the reflexive. The only discussion I have found of the rules governing clitics in “literary” Spanish is that of Marathon Montrose Ramsey, *A Textbook of Modern Spanish*, revised by Robert K. Spaulding, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1956, §4.1–§4.15.

¹¹³*Tolondron* (n. [7](#), above) pp. 243–256; examples of Bowle’s confusion about accents are found in n. [30](#), above. Bowle declared his intent of following the original orthography in the *Letter to Dr. Percy* (n. [10](#), above) p. 116. Shortly after, however, he wrote to the Spanish consul Miguel de Ventades that he would follow the Spanish Academy’s orthography, as was apparently recommended to him (letter of May 20, 1777, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 68).

As will be seen in my edition of his *Dissertacion epistolar acerca unas obras* [sic] *de la Academia Española* (*Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, in press), Baretto is an orthographic theorist and reformer, making fun of the Academy with almost as much joy as he has in attacking Bowle.

¹¹⁴After publication of his edition, when presumably he was no longer reading many books in Spanish, his Spanish deteriorates, as seen in the letters published in “Correspondence” (n. [11](#), above).

agrees that his Spanish desperately needed a good going-over from someone more expert in the language than he. Bowle in fact had such a person, his collaborator John Talbot Dillon; what is more remarkable, Bowle conserved a letter with Dillon's sensible corrections to part of the prologue, which can be found incorporated into the published text.¹¹⁵ Yet he was unable to learn from this and see the need for a thorough linguistic revision. After all, he had read Covarrubias from beginning to end; he knew *Don Quixote* in large part by heart; he had read, or skimmed, a very large number of Spanish books. He knew French and Italian and Latin, and was blind to the shortcomings of his Spanish.

With the publication of his *Letter to Dr. Percy* Bowle had one enemy, Baretto; after the publication of his edition he had a second, Crookshanks. Baretto was in London while Bowle, of course, was out in a small country village. We know from Bowle's reaction that Baretto was criticizing his edition in literary circles. Bowle should have let matters stand, but he let fly with a scurrilous pamphlet called *Remarks on the Extraordinary Conduct of the Knight of the Ten Stars and his Italian Esquire, to the Editor of Don Quixote: the Knight of the Ten Stars* (C*****) is Crookshanks.¹¹⁶ I have not had the heart to edit and publish this text. In a further failing he then sent four pseudonymous letters to *Gentleman's Magazine*, each signed with a different name but of obvious authorship because they were all attacks on the same two individuals.¹¹⁷ However, what I want to focus on in the time I have left is Baretto's reply: his book *Tolondron*, which is a linguistic tour de force and as Truman has shown,¹¹⁸ hastened Bowle's demise. Just as Bowle's *Letter to Dr. Percy* began *Don Quixote* studies, *Tolondron* marks the beginning of Cervantine controversy.

Baretto, friend of Samuel Johnson, was a plurilingual lexicographer as well as a polemicist, who published the first Italian-English dictionary and is the author of a noteworthy

¹¹⁵“Dos emisiones” (n. [25](#), above) p. 48 n. 3. The “first part of my Prólogo” was sent to Dillon on January 18, 1781 (Cox, *Ilustrado* (n. [3](#), above) p. 83). On April 10 he writes Dillon that “Mi prólogo a las Anotaciones I have at length completed, and the part which I communicated to you is t the press” (quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* p. 84).

¹¹⁶*Remarks on the Extraordinary Conduct of the Knight of the Ten Stars and his Italian Esquire, to the Editor of Don Quixote, in a Letter to the Rev. J.S. D.D.*, London: G. & T. Wilkie, 1785. It has been microfilmed and is available on reel 13767 of the series *The Eighteenth Century*, Woodbridge, CT: Primary Source Microfilm, 1982–. (This series is being digitized.) The only known copy of this pamphlet is in the Bodleian Library, for which notice I am indebted to Truman.

¹¹⁷The letters are reproduced in notes to my edition of *Tolondron* (n. [7](#), above) pp. 186–187, 194–195, 199, and 204–205.

¹¹⁸“Bowle's Quixotic Woes” (n. [72](#), above) pp. 33–34. Truman provides additional information about the Bowle–Baretto–Crookshanks enmity.

Spanish-English dictionary.¹¹⁹ His life was marked by controversies, and he made so many enemies in his native Italy that he had to leave the country and settle in England, where he lived for many years until his death.¹²⁰ *Tolondron* is a display of his learning from the very title, an unusual, *rebuscada* word: a bump on the head and by extension, a simpleton. It is learned, well written, and very funny, a creative and even poetical attack on Bowle and his edition. Baretto identifies the authorship of and responds to the four pseudonymous letters and to Bowle's *Remarks on the Extraordinary Conduct* which I just mentioned. He delights in pointing out Bowle's linguistic errors, and says that his notes are unnecessary and worthless. "Far from harbouring any such idea, or hinting, that, to understand his *Don Quixote*, we were to read the chivalry and other silly books he had read himself, Cervantes condemned them all to be burnt by means of the Curate.... Fling you, Mr. John Bowle, fling into the fire your *Comento* likewise; as I tell it you again, that there is not *one line* throughout *Don Quixote* in want of any of your explanations; or point out *only one*, that you have explained better, than any Spanish girl could have done" (p. 264).

Of course Baretto was wrong. In 1797 Pellicer published an annotated edition in Spain, and Bowle's real triumph is that explanatory and textual notes are now so normal that we forget that they were once controversial. Baretto's Spanish wasn't flawless either. I am editing his *Dissertacion epistolar acerca unas obras [sic] de la Academia Española*, in which he lays into the 1780 Academia edition and its orthography, a book for which Bowle had only praise.

I'm going to close with an excerpt from *Tolondron*, which bears on the title page the following quote from a play of Antonio de Solís:

Cosa digna de embidia
Es el consuelo que gastan
Los Bobos en este mundo,
Y aquella gran confianza
De que imaginan, que son
Sentencias las patochadas. (p. 151)

Baretto calls Bowle "Your Tolodronship" (p. 200), "Doctor Tolondron" (p. 224), "Monsieur de Tolondron" (p. 182), "mon cher Marquis de la Tolondroniere" (p. 232), "le Baron de Tolondrognac", (p. 232), "tolondron tolondrissimo" (p. 214), "princeps tolondronorum" (p.

¹¹⁹ *A Dictionary, Spanish and English, and English and Spanish: containing the Signification of Words, and their Different Uses...and the Spanish Words Accented and Spelled according to the Regulation of the Royal Spanish Academy of Madrid*, London, 1778. It is reproduced in the microfilm series *The Eighteenth Century*, reel 6186 (on this series, see the previous note).

¹²⁰"Cet Italien fougueux a entrepris des polémiques semblables presque sans interruption au cours de sa longue vie. ...Bowle au contraire était un pasteur paisible qui n'avait jamais d'histoires avec personne." (The quotation from Hilton (n. 32, above) Chapter 7, "Un Duel entre Hispanophiles: Baretto et John Bowle".)

There is a considerable bibliography on Baretto. As a start, see Ettore Bonora, "Baretto e la Spagna", *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* CLXVIII (1991), pp. 335–374.

265), and similar insults. At the beginning of one of his “speeches” or chapters he has a quote from Shakespeare, “Methinks thou art a general offence, / and every body should beat thee” (p. 165). Besides Shakespeare, he begins chapters with quotations from Rabelais in French and Horace and Erasmus in Latin, although he may have invented the quote from Erasmus. One chapter begins with the following invented quotation from a non-existent Isidro de Figuera:

Con rostro firme, y con serena frente,
Como habla el hideputa y como miente! (p. 157)

His point of departure in the episode I’m going to read is Bowle’s criticism of Baretto for using the expression “de cabo a rabo”, claiming that it was an Anglicism.¹²¹ Baretto replies that he can cite authorities to prove that it is a genuine Spanish turn of phrase, and gives some examples:

You say, Mr. John, that in the course of twenty years, among other Spanish Authors, you have read *Ribadeneira’s Flos Sanctorum*: but have you ever read that other work of the same Author, entitled *Flos Stultorum*? *Ribadeneira*, in a short *Zarzuela*, entitled *El Editor sin seso*, makes *Mariposa*, a coy *Gitana*, or Gypsy, ask the *Gracioso* this question:

Como llamas a este cero
De cabo en rabo majadero?

To which the *Gracioso* answers:

Preguntas por el Bolocho
De cabo en rabo tonto y tocho?
Maldito él si yo lo sé:
Púparo, péparo, paparé.

And here, as a *marginal note* tells us, the *Gracioso* kicks about, and cuts a great many capers.

Have you any thing to say to this quotation from your beloved *Ribadeneira*? Now for another from the facetious *Chufleteneira*, who, in his second book, chapter the second, page the second, column the second, and line the second (you see I can be as exact as you in my quotations) speaking of a ball given by the *Alcalde* of *Mofadilla*, upon occasion, that one *Juan Bolo* was chosen *Mosen*, or *Vicar* of that *Aldeguela*,¹²² registers a lively *Xacara* that was sung and danced by the boys and girls admitted to partake of that feast.

The *Xacara* runs thus:

¹²¹*Remarks on the Extraordinary Conduct*, cited by Baretto, *Tolondron* (n. 7, above) p. 171.

¹²²Bowle was vicar of the village of Idmiston.

Cantan las Mozas; that is, The Girls Sing.

Vaya vaya de Xácara,
Gallardos Zagalejos,
Si sois los buenos páxaros
Que parecéis de lejos:
Cantad y bailad,
Bailad y cantad
De nuestro Mosén Bolo
Chichirichólo,
Chichirichón,
De cabo en rabo Tolondrón.

Cantan los Mozos; that is, the Boys sing....

These two quotations, Mr. Bowle, ought to satisfy you quite with regard to the legitimacy of my phrase: but, as I am of a liberal, rather than of a *diabolical* nature, as you would make me believe I am, here goes another quotation out of the heroic poem, entitled *El Comentador Charlatan*, lately published by *Don Lope Bufonadaneira*, who calls himself *Muñidor de la devota Cofradía de los Truhanes Manchegos y Estremeños*. Thus does this great Epepeian describe his principal hero, a haughty *Presbiterillo* called *Juanito Bastarduco*, in the second stanza of his second Canto:

No sé si su Merced es hembra, o macho,
Eunuco, hermafrodita, o cuero, o bota:
Si sabe a Inglés, a galgo, o a moharracho,
Si es olla hendida, o calabaza rota:
Si tiene tiña, o sarna, o si vá gacho;
Ni si es zago de iglesia, o de picota:
Si lleva, o no, por calavera un nabo;
Mas sé, que es Charlatán de cabo en rabo. (pp. 173–175)

This is what Bowle had to endure, which, as Truman has documented, embittered his final years and hastened his demise. Bowle would no doubt approve of ending with a quotation from his beloved Cervantes: “dondequiera que está la virtud en eminente grado, es perseguida” (II, 2).

Changes with regard to the version published (in press, as of May 2006) by Juan de la Cuesta:

In note [5](#), changed final sentence to read “It took Bowle less time to obtain his subscribers (four years) than it has taken to get the 2006 facsimile published, even though today Cervantine

studies is a well-established discipline. John J. Allen called for the reprint in 1989 (in a review of *Cervantine Correspondence* (n. 2, above), *Hispanic Review*, LVII (1989), p. 234), and it has been a project of R. Merritt Cox since the late 1960s.”

In note [21](#), changed “Dillon” to “John Talbot Dillon” and added “letter to Dillon of April 6, 1780”.

In note [25](#), added sentence “According to the same article, n. 23, Bowle also bound additional pages into a copy of the 1738 edition, used to index and write additions to Mayans’ life of Cervantes”.

Added new note [28](#) and renumbered subsequent notes.

In note [31](#), added the words “to the Spanish consul Miguel de Ventades” and added two new final sentences on him.

In note [40](#), added new final sentence and changed beginning of following sentence: “Writing to Pellicer on February 25, 1779, he says that “La primera parte del Texto esta finalizada” (“Correspondence” p. 121). This must refer to printing and not preparation of printer’s copy, because in a letter to John Crookshanks...”

Added new note [41](#) and renumbered subsequent notes.

In note [42](#), removed parentheses around *Cervantine Correspondence*, and corrected a misprint: adding a space after “and” and before “left”.

Added new note [43](#) and renumbered subsequent notes.

In notes [46](#), [75](#), and [115](#), changed “quoted in Cox” to “quoted by Cox”.

Added new note [47](#) and renumbered subsequent notes.

In note [51](#), replaced the final sentence with “I do not know if this is the same as the “Vocabulario cervantesco” referred to above (p. 7), or a derivative of it.”

In note [83](#), added “in a letter to Dillon of October 25, 1777, he wrote “A gentleman of the north of England quite unknown to me brought this with him to London last spring solely for my use” (quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* p. 69)”. Changed sentence “In contrast with the “acaso” in the letter to Pellicer, when writing to Collingswood...” to “In contrast with the “acaso” in the letter to Pellicer of 1784, when writing to him in 1779 he said “Tengo para mi que Esta de 1608 fue corregida, y revisada por el Autor” (“Correspondence” p. 121; this letter never reached Pellicer, as Bowle notes in his second letter to him, “Correspondence” p. 133). When writing to Collingswood...”. Added at the end “similarly in a letter to Dillon of October 25, 1777, quoted by Cox, *Ilustrado* p. 69)”.

Added new note [101](#) and renumbered subsequent notes.

On page [8](#), added the word “early” in “because early in 1777”.

On page [11](#), changed the sentence “completed in 1779” to “completed no later than June of 1779”.

On page [12](#), added new sentence, “The draft of most of the notes, however, was complete by late 1778”, followed by new note [43](#).

On page [13](#), changed the sentence “I have elsewhere pointed out that almost certainly some parts of the edition volume were distributed to purchasers unbound, and thus we understand why different copies have the list of Errata or map bound in different places, or missing.” to “In view of this, it is more understandable that some parts of the edition were distributed to purchasers unbound, as I have elsewhere pointed out; different copies have the list of Errata or map bound in different places, or missing.”

On page [15](#), added “Beginning in 1769 with *Amadis de Gaula* (III, p. 7)”, before “Bowle read as

many of these as he could obtain”.

On page [17](#), changed “published works” to “published books”. On page [23](#), added new bullet 10 and renumbered subsequent bullets.

On page [23](#), corrected misprint in bullet 15 (“p.” to “pp.”).