

Tilting at Windmills: *Don Quijote* in English

MICHAEL J. McGRATH

PRINTED ON THE INSIDE jacket of Edith Grossman's 2003 translation of *Don Quijote* is the following statement: "Unless you read Spanish, you have never read *Don Quixote*." For many people, the belief that a novel should be read in its original language is not controvertible. The Russian writer Dostoevsky learned Spanish just to be able to read *Don Quijote*. Lord Byron described his reading of the novel in Spanish as "a pleasure before which all others vanish" (*Don Juan* 14.98). Unfortunately, there are many readers who are unable to read the novel in its original language, and those who depend upon an English translation may read a version that is linguistically and culturally quite different from the original. In his article "Traduttori Traditori: *Don Quixote* in English," John Jay Allen cites the number of errors he encountered in different translations as a reason for writing the article. In addition, according to Allen, literary scholarship runs the risk of being skewed as a result of the translator's inability to capture the text's original meaning:

I think that we Hispanists tend to forget that the overwhelming majority of comments on *Don Quixote* by non-Spaniards—novelists, theoreticians of literature, even comparatists—are based upon readings in translation, and I, for one, had never considered just what this might mean for interpretation. The notorious difficulty in establishing the locus of value in *Don Quixote* should alert us to the tremendous influence a translator may have in tipping the balance in what is obviously a delicate equilibrium of ambiguity and multivalence. (1)

Burton Raffel, the translator of the 1995 Norton edition of the novel, acknowledges in the Introduction the importance of recreating in English the Spanish elements of the novel: "I want this translation to *sound* like it's set in Spain to feel as Spanish as possible.... It's not a book that could have been written in English—or indeed in any other language. *Don Quijote's* magnificence is indubitably Hispanic" (xv). Eight English translations have appeared since 1949. Now that 400 years have passed since the publication of Part I of Miguel de Cervantes' masterpiece, do we have today the English translations we need to appreciate *Don Quijote*?

In my comparison of the most significant points of the novel, I refer to the following English translations of *Don Quijote*:¹

1. *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha. A new translation from the Spanish, with a Critical Text Based on the First Editions of 1605 and 1615, and with Variant Readings, Variorum Notes, and an Introduction by Samuel Putnam.* New York: Viking, 1949.
2. *The Adventures of Don Quixote.* Translated by J[ohn] M[ichael] Cohen. 1950. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1975.
3. *Don Quixote of la Mancha.* Translated and with an Introduction by Walter Starkie. New York: New American Library, 1964.
4. *Don Quixote. The Ormsby Translation, Revised. Backgrounds and Sources. Criticism.* Edited by Joseph R. Jones and Kenneth Douglas. (Henceforth referred to as ODJ, in the order of the participation of each.) New York: W. W. Norton, 1981.
5. *Don Quijote.* Trans. Burton Raffel. [Introduction by Diana de Armas Wilson. New York: W. W. Norton, 1995.] *A New Translation. Backgrounds and Contexts. Criticism.* Edited by Diana de Armas Wilson. 1998. New York: W. W. Norton, 1999.
6. *The Ingenious Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha.* Translated by John Rutherford, with an introduction by Roberto González Echevarría. 2000 (without the introduction). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 2001.

¹ James Montgomery published a translation of the novel titled *The Adventures and Misadventures of Don Quixote: An Up-to-date Translation for Today's Readers* after I submitted this article. I will write a book review of Montgomery's translation for a future number of the journal.

7. *Don Quixote*. Translated by **Edith Grossman**. New York: HarperCollins, 2003.
8. *Don Quixote*. Fourth-Centenary Translation. Trans. and with notes by **Tom Lathrop**. Illustrated by Jack Davis. Newark, DE: European Masterpieces, 2007.

Since my focus is on the quality of the translations and not that of the volumes, I am not commenting on introductions, secondary material, or notes, except as they relate to questions of translations.

In Part II, Chapter 62, Cervantes, through the character of Don Quixote, offers this opinion on translations: “me parece que el traducir de una lengua en otra, como no sea de las reinas de las lenguas, griega y latina, es como quien mira los tapices flamencos por el revés, que, aunque se ven las figuras, son llenas de hilos que las escurecen, y no se ven con la lisura y tez de la haz...” (II, 62; 555).² The translator of *Don Quijote* must share the knight-errant’s quixotic vision in order to produce a translation that does not appear as “Flemish tapestries seen from the back.” The earliest translations, those of Thomas Shelton (1612 and 1620),³ John Phillips (1687), Peter Motteux (1712), and Tobias Smollet (1755), are often inaccurate, as these translators took many liberties with the novel. Motteux went so far as to eliminate sentences and insert text of his own.⁴ Charles Jervas, in 1742, produced a translation that attempted to recreate the original as closely as possible. His style of translation, however, did not capture Cervantes’ wit and transformed the novel into a solemn book. In the nineteenth century, the popularity of John Ormsby’s (1885) version superseded Alexander Duffield’s (1881) and Henry Edward Watts’ (1888) translations.

In the introduction to his translation, Watts provides a description of what John Rutherford (xxviii) calls the “puritan” translator:

The translator should efface himself, for it is not he whom the public have come to see, but the author. To intrude one’s own nineteenth-century personality into such a book as *Don Quixote*, is an offence as gross against good manners as against art. A worse crime than

2 Spanish passages are from John Jay Allen’s edition.

3 In contrast with the 1612 translation of Part I, the first (1620) translation of Part II does not supply the name of its translator. While traditionally attributed to Shelton, Anthony Lo Ré has argued that it in fact the work of Leonard Digges. See his studies in the list of Works Cited.

4 Bertram D. Wolfe described Motteux’s translation as “odious.”

this, however, is to deck the author as well as his book in your own colours—to put on him your livery—to make him speak after a set manner—to torture and twist his character, as well as his work, into conformity with some fantastic idea in the translator's brain.⁵

More recent translations are less conventional, as the translators aspire to present an accurate translation without sacrificing Cervantes' style. This approach, however, is problematic. How do translators produce both a text that appeals to today's readership and yet is faithful to the language and style of the original? In addition, how do they write in English and maintain the peculiarities of the original language? Language, as the expression of a culture, contains inherent expressions that are used primarily for effect. Texans refer to anything large as "bigger than Dallas." If a person does not want to do something, she might say: "I'd rather go over Niagara Falls in a barrel." A reader who reads these sayings in another language would need a cultural explanation to understand the references. The same is true of a reader of *Don Quijote* in English. Its many topical allusions require a translator with intimate knowledge of Spanish culture. In addition, this same translator must be able to communicate effectively the nuances of the language, a task that is further complicated by Sancho Panza's numerous witty sayings and malapropisms. While it is nearly impossible for translators to reproduce precisely Sancho's wit, they can preserve the original meaning of the text with a translation that makes sense. It is important, therefore, that the translator find the right words to convey the same idea.

Words alone, however, do not make a translation effective. It is necessary that the translator also recreate the original author's style of writing. That is, the way he/she uses words, arranges the parts of a sentence, and finally puts the sentences into a paragraph. For example, *Don Quijote* has many long and complex sentences that on the surface would be easy to shorten in translation. This abbreviation, however, changes Cervantes' style of dialogue. Cervantes' distinctive style of writing certainly complicates the translation process, and translators must somehow find a way to produce a translation that is accurate and makes sense to a contemporary readership, while not compromising literary genius. In his review of Raffel's translation, Steven Wagschal compares translating *Don Quijote* to a Gordian knot: "The translator must make compromises to preserve

⁵ *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of la Mancha*, trans. Henry Edward Watts (London, 1888).

faithfully the original values and appeal simultaneously to a contemporary audience" (148).

The introductions and prefaces to each of the translations serve as the reader's initial orientation to what changes the reader can expect from the original, as well as, in some cases, a statement or two about the translator's philosophy. What follows is a summary of this introductory material in chronological order. All translators except Starkie provide an introduction.

Samuel Putnam (1949): In order to be consistent with the names that appear more than once, Putnam leaves the names of people in their original form. He does translate, however, the names of monarchs. In addition, he anglicizes geographic names (e.g. Cordova instead of Córdoba, and Saragossa in place of Zaragoza). Putnam, unlike Ormsby, translates words that he feels have "a near enough equivalent" (xxvii). Putnam provides as examples of these words *alforja*, which he translates as *saddlebags*, and *bota*, translated as *wine flask*; he explains that words that can be translated with little difficulty, but are not, only slow up the average reader. Another example of a translation that resembles closely the original is *cura*, which Putnam translates as *curate*. He rejects as "too quaint" the translation "Dapple" for the name of Sancho Panza's donkey (xxvii). As a noun, Putnam explains, the name should be a noun, not an adjective. He chooses to refer to Sancho's donkey as "ass" or "donkey." In his desire to modernize the translation, Putnam renders *vuesa merced* as "you," rather than "thou," in episodes that do not use archaic language. In addition, he takes liberties with the punctuation, the dialogue transitions, and the structure of paragraphs and sentences. Putnam believes modernization of the style is a necessity, for the Spanish language is nearly impossible to translate into English without making stylistic changes:

The Spanish language in general, and the Spanish of Cervantes in particular, have a terseness which, one may as well admit it, cannot be carried over into English; but with Cervantes this is a terseness that is achieved *within* a long and sprawling sentence marked by an intricate interweaving of clauses loosely connected by a series of *que's* and relative pronouns. Any attempt to preserve this sentence structure—and Ormsby does attempt it—can lead only to obscurity in English, as it sometimes does in Spanish, conveying an impression of dullness which is decidedly unfair to the author. (xxviii)

Putnam espouses the addition of words to the text in instances when these words provide clarification, especially when the confusion is a result of problematic pronoun antecedents. He informs the reader that he does call attention, mainly in footnotes, to Cervantes' contradictions and inconsistencies, but he does so only to comment on Cervantes' literary style. While Putnam preserves the rhyme schemes of Cervantes' verse, namely Antonio's ballad in Part I, Chapter 11, and Grisóstomo's song in Part I, Chapter 14, he does not attempt to recreate the assonance or medial rhymes. Putnam states that he is using the *princeps* editions of 1605 and 1615, presumably in facsimile.

J[ohn] M[ichael] Cohen (1950): First published in 1950, Cohen's translation remained in print until about 1975. His stated aim was to translate *Don Quijote* with "the task of reconciling faithfulness to Cervantes with the writing of contemporary English" (11). While Cohen recognizes that earlier translations resemble the original in spirit, he believes previous translators failed to capture the genius of Cervantes' language. Unlike Putnam, Cohen anglicizes the names of the characters. With the exception of episodes in which the Spanish is archaic for effect, Cohen modernizes both vocabulary and syntax. While Cohen translates the majority of Sancho's sayings with his own words, he inserts occasionally English sayings that resemble closely the original. Cohen points out that the "stilted language" (19) of the pastoral narratives makes it difficult to achieve a translation that flows freely. Due to a dearth of suitable translations, Cohen tones down oaths and expletives and admits that a lack of faith in his own ability to translate effectively the interpolated poems is the reason he relies on earlier translators' versions of the poetry. Cohen's footnotes are scanty, and he explains that "the obscurities are few, and no attempts to explain them do much more than pile up indigestible historical references, that prevent the reader from getting along with the book" (20). In his discussion of Cervantes' life and the novel, Cohen writes that Part I appeared in 1604, Part II in 1614, and Cervantes died in 1615 (18).⁶ Cohen does not state which Spanish version he consulted.

John Ormsby/Kenneth Douglas/Joseph R. Jones (ODJ, 1981): Before his untimely death, Kenneth Douglas had begun to revise

⁶ Although this was not known in Cohen's day, and the date 1604 is an ignorant error, it has recently been established that Part I was actually on sale in December of 1604. See Rico.

Ormsby's 1885 translation.⁷ The publisher Norton then asked Joseph R. Jones to finish the work begun by Douglas. Jones explains that while his goal was to preserve the genius of the original as much as possible, his revisions have the American university student as the target readership: "My experience has taught me that American students by and large look for speed of comprehension and pace, and either they will have both or they will simply stop reading" (xi). In an effort to produce a version appropriate for American university students, and one that does not interrupt the pace of reading, Jones adheres to current conventions of spelling, punctuation, and paragraphing. Instead of explanatory footnotes for rare words, he inserts translations that are "reasonable or easily visualized substitutes" (xi). Jones deals with proverbs in two ways. If the meaning of the proverb is obvious, he substitutes it with a rhyming translation that sounds like a proverb. In addition, Jones replaces proverbs that are difficult to understand with other well-known proverbs. Since oaths are either untranslatable or awkward, to American ears, in Ormsby's version, Jones translates them freely. Similar to Putnam, Jones modernizes forms of address in everyday conversation, but he does not do so when they are meant to enhance effect. Douglas/Jones consulted Martín de Riquer's revised edition of the novel (Planeta, 1962) for accuracy.

Burton Raffel (1995, second edition, with expanded secondary material, 1999): Raffel's translation, whose second edition replaced the ODJ translation in the Norton Critical Edition series, is based upon Riquer's 1980 edition of the novel (Planeta). He aims to present a faithful recreation of the syntactical organization and movement (pace, linguistic density, and structural transitions) of the novel's prose. In addition, he tries to match as closely as possible the rhetoric of the prose. Rhetorical substitutions, however, "are in truth a good deal less important than such larger matters as style, pacing, fidelity to authorial intent, and the like" (xvii). Brief explanations in brackets within the text accompany important yet untranslatable material. Raffel uses footnotes for lengthy explanations and retains the original form of Spanish names whenever possible.

John Rutherford (2000): After publishing Cohen's translation in 1950, and taking it through some nine printings, Penguin replaced it

⁷ Ormsby's translation, of course in the public domain, is the only English translation publicly available on the Internet.

with Rutherford's translation. Rutherford consulted Luis A. Murillo's Spanish edition of the novel (Castalia, 1978) and María Moliner's *Diccionario del uso del español* (Gredos, 1966-67), in addition to three English translations, which he does not identify. Rutherford summarizes his approach to his translation in the following way:

What I tried to do was different: to let the Spanish words construct in my mind's eye the world of the novel, and to live in that world; to see and hear Don Quixote and Sancho and to make them my best friends (some loss of sanity is a price that any artist has to pay); and only then to search for the English words with which to describe what I found in my imagination. (xxvii)

Rutherford rejects the idea of the "invisible translator." Just as Cervantes used the language of his day, Rutherford believes a translation should use the language of its day. For this reason, he modernizes the language of both the dialogues and the narrations. He does not, however, modernize the novel's oaths and insults, for he believes that contemporary expletives cannot do them justice. While Rutherford admits that it would be easy to shorten complex sentences and correct grammatical inaccuracies, to preserve Cervantes' literary style he does neither. Rutherford describes the process of translating as an "impossible goal" (xxxii), for translators are unable to achieve the perfection they desire. Like modern knights-errant, he adds, translators must aspire to come as close as possible to the perfect translation.

Edith Grossman (2003): Grossman establishes from the outset of her introduction the enormous challenge of translating *Don Quijote*, a task she refers to as a "daunting and inspiring enterprise" (xviii). It was not until Spanish novelist Julián Ríos explained to Grossman that Cervantes was in many respects a modern writer did she start to feel comfortable with the endeavor that lay ahead. Grossman summarizes her philosophy of translating in this way:

For me this is the essential challenge in translation: hearing, in the most profound way I can, the text in Spanish and discovering the voice to say (I mean, to write) the text again in English. Compared to that, lexical difficulties shrink and wither away. (xix)

She considered leaving the protagonist's name in the original, but instead

chose to write it with an “x” to emphasize the connection with “quixotic.” Unlike other translations she has done, Grossman uses footnotes in this one only when she needs to explain obscure references and complex allusions. Her translation is based upon one of Riquer’s editions of *Don Quijote*, though she does not specify which.

Tom Lathrop (2007): Lathrop’s translation has as its primary objective a version that adheres as closely as possible to the first edition of the novel. Unlike other translators, who rely on later Spanish editions, Lathrop (the only English translator who has also edited the Spanish text) chooses to translate from the first edition because the contradictions and supposed errors were put in the work on purpose, to mimic the books of chivalry on all levels, not only characters and types of adventures, but also the details of the careless writing style of those books—careless and/or misinformed chapter titles, contradictions of all types, inconsistencies of time and place, etc. (I, Introduction). Lathrop believes that editors who “correct” Cervantes’ supposed errors produce a text that misrepresents his intent. Lathrop does not translate monetary terms or certain words and expressions (e.g. señor). In addition, he alters very little the manner in which Sancho speaks.

A translation that only distorts but does not misrepresent the original with serious implications is perhaps the least significant kind of mistake. For example, the first line of the novel, “En un lugar de La Mancha, de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme, vivía un hidalgo de los de lanza en astillero, adarga antigua, rocín flaco y galgo corredor” (97), illustrates how translators distort the original. I will cite three examples. All but two of the translators, Raffel and Rutherford, translated “no quiero” as either “do not wish” (Cohen 31 and Starkie 56), “do not care” (Grossman 19), “do not desire” (Putnam 25) or “prefer not” (ODJ 25). Raffel’s translation “(I don’t want to bother you with its name)” (13), while somewhat awkward sounding, underscores the insignificance that Cervantes attributes to naming the village. Rutherford’s translation “the name of which I cannot quite recall” (25) and Lathrop’s “whose name I don’t quite” do not, however, communicate as effectively as the other translations. Cervantes desire not to name a specific village that can call itself the home of Don Quixote. Another distortion is the translation of the word *hidalgo*, which appears in all but one of the translations as “gentleman.” The meanings of the two words, however, are quite different. According to the *Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary*, a gentleman is a “man

of good breeding, kindness, courtesy, and honor” or “any man of ordinary respectability and good behavior, regardless of occupation, family, or the like.” In addition, it is a polite way of referring to any man in English. The *Diccionario de autoridades* defines *hidalgo* as “la persona noble que viene de casa y solar conocido, y como tal está exento de los pechos y derechos que pagan los villanos” (1979). The translation “gentleman,” therefore, is misleading, as it does not necessarily imply nobility. Given the semantic differences, perhaps a description that represents a specific reference to nobility would be more appropriate, such as a low-ranking nobleman. Lathrop is the only translator not to translate *hidalgo* as “gentleman.” In fact, he leaves the word in its original form and in a footnote explains that an *hidalgo* is a “member of the lesser nobility, exempt from taxes” (17). Finally, a third variation of the first line is the translation of *adarga*. All of the translators except Putnam and Starkie translate the word as “shield.” These two translators prefer “buckler,” which is a shield that fastens to the arm. The *Diccionario de autoridades* defines *adarga* as “cierto género de escudo compuesto de duplicados cueros, engrudados, y cosidos unos con otros, de figura casi oval, y algunos de la de un corazón: por la parte interior tiene en el medio dos asas, la primera entra en el brazo izquierdo, y la segunda se empuña con la mano.” Even though Putnam and Starkie remain loyal to the original meaning of the word, the other translators utilize a more general term with which English speakers are more apt to identify.

In his article “Traduttori Traditori: *Don Quixote* in English,” John Jay Allen cites the following verses from Grisóstomo’s Song, Part I, Chapter 14, in which the shepherd contemplates suicide as another example of translators’ distortion of the original:

¡Oh, en el reino de amor fieros tiranos
celos!, ponedme un hierro en esta manos.
Dame, desdén, una torcida sogá. (220)

The most accurate translation seems to be Charles Jervas’s, from his 1742 translation titled *The Adventures of Don Quixote de la Mancha*:

O cruel tyrant of the realm of love,
Fierce Jealously, arm with a sword this hand,
Or thou, Disdain, a twisted cord bestow. (47)

Putnam’s translation is the most problematic, as he not only distorts the

original, but also fails to translate the entire passage: “O ye fierce tyrants of Love’s empery! / Shackle these hands with stout cord, if ye must” (117). Cohen, Starkie, ODJ, Grossman, and Lathrop seem to model their translations after Shelton’s 1620 translation:

Oh, tyrant of love’s state, fierce jealousy!
With cruel chains these hands together tie,
With stubborn cords coupled them, rough disdain! (103)

Cohen: O tyrant of love’s state, fierce jealousy!
With cruel chains these hands together tie,
With twisted rope couple them, rough disdain! (105)

Starkie: Tyrant of love’s realm, savage Jealousy,
In mercy clap thy manacles on me;
Thou, Disdain, tie my hands with twisted rope. (139)

ODJ: Oh, thou fierce tyrant of the realms of love,
Oh, Jealousy! Put chains upon these hands,
And bind me with thy strongest cord, Disdain. (92)

Grossman: O jealousy, in the kingdom of love
a pitiless tyrant, place these my hands
in chains. And condemn me, disdain,
to be bound in twisted rope. (96)

Lathrop: Oh, thou fierce tyrant of the realms of love,
Oh, Jealousy! Put chains upon these hands,
And bind me with thy strongest cord, Disdain. (9)

Unlike the aforementioned translators, both Rutherford and Raffel translate “hierro” not as chains but as a sword or a sharp weapon:

Rutherford: Fierce tyrant of all Love’s imperial lands,
O Jealousy, place cold steel in these hands!
Give me, Disdain, a rope of twisted thread! (106)

Raffel: Oh Jealousy, lend me your sharpest blade,
You fiercest tyrant in all the kingdom of love!
And you, Disdain, give me a twisted rope! (75)

According to the *Diccionario de autoridades*, a *hierro* is “el instrumento que sirve para herir: como la espada, puñal.” Rutherford’s and Raffel’s translations are most similar in meaning to the original. Putnam, Cohen, Starkie, ODJ, Grossman, and Lathrop slightly distort Cervantes’ text, yet, with the exception of Putnam, their translations do not misrepresent the original.

In Part II, Chapter 24 there is yet another example of a distortion that does not seriously impact the original. When Don Quijote and Sancho go to a hermitage to speak with a hermit, they find instead a “sotaermitaño” (235), which Allen describes in a footnote as a “compañera del ermitaño.” The visit to the hermitage justifies Don Quijote’s earlier remarks about the life of hermits:

...sino que quiero decir que al rigor y estrechez de entonces no llegan las penitencias de los de agora; pero no por esto dejan de ser todos buenos: a lo menos, yo por buenos los juzgo; y cuando todo corra turbio, menos mal hace el hipócrita que se finge bueno que el público pecador. (234)

Not all translators, however, communicate to the reader the implied relationship between the male and female hermits. Putnam not only identifies as the hermit a female, but also includes a note that describes the relationship between the two hermits: “In this sub-hermit one may behold the brazen countenance of the anchorite’s Magdalen” (1186). Cohen (616), Starkie (699), and Rutherford (650) identify the “sotaermitaño” as an “under-hermitess,” without further explanation. In addition to the correct translation, “female sub-hermit,” Douglas/Jones explain in a footnote that “the suggestion is that the absent hermit has a concubine” (560). Raffel describes her as a “female servant” (489) and has a footnote similar to the one in the ODJ translation. Grossman’s translation “assistant hermit” (617) is misleading. Finally, Lathrop identifies the “sotaermitaño” as a “female sub-hermit” (II, 24). The translations that inform the reader that the hermit is a woman do not distort the original with any negative consequences, but they do rely upon the reader to interpret the relationship between Don Quijote’s remarks and the presence of the female hermit in the hermitage.

Translations that semantically distort the original are not as serious, I believe, as those that are insensitive to the ethical issues that concerned Cervantes. In Cervantes’ response to Avellaneda’s accusation in

the Prologue to Part II that Cervantes disparaged Lope de Vega in Part I, Cervantes makes the following comment about the playwright:

no tengo yo de perseguir a ningún sacerdote, y más si tiene por añadidura ser familiar del Santo Oficio; y si él lo dijo por quien parece que lo dijo, engañóse de todo en todo; que del tal adoro el ingenio, admiro las obras, y la ocupación continua y virtuosa. (26)

Translators, however, fail to recognize the allusion to Lope, especially the irony of “la ocupación continua y virtuosa:”

Putnam: it is not likely that I should attack any priest, above all, one that is a familiar of the Holy Office. If he made this statement, as it appears that he did, on behalf of a certain person, then he is utterly mistaken; for the person in question is one whose genius I hold in veneration and whose works I admire, as well as his constant industry and powers of application. (592)

In a note (1172), Putnam refers to Lope de Vega only within the context of his explanation of the reference to the Holy Office. Cohen, too, neglects to inform the reader of the irony:

And that being the case I am not likely to persecute any priest, particularly if he is a familiar of the Holy Office to boot. And if it was on behalf of a certain person that he wrote what he did, he is absolutely mistaken; for I revere that man’s genius, and admire his works and his virtuous and unceasing industry. (468)

Starkie’s translation is similar to that of Putnam and Cohen, except that Starkie explains the irony in a footnote:

Lope de Vega, moreover, was a Familiar of the Holy Office and caution was the best policy in answering. For this reason he [Cervantes] declares his admiration for Lope’s genius but adds in his most ironic vein: “...his ever virtuous way of life.” He knew the scandals that had arisen concerning Lope’s private life, which are fully revealed in the private correspondence between the great dramatist and his patron, the Duke of Sessa. (526)

Like Putnam, ODJ (415) and Raffel (360) explain in a note that Lope

was a servant of the Holy Office, but they do not provide a translation or a note to reveal the irony behind Cervantes' "admiration" of Lope. Rutherford's translation contains a subtle hint of irony:

I'm not going to start persecuting any priests, still less if they're familiars of the Holy Office as well; and if when he said this he was thinking about the man I have in mind, he's completely mistaken, because I adore that man's creativity and I admire his works and his unceasing, virtuous virtuosity. (484)

In addition, he explains in a note about the Holy Office that Lope, even though a priest, "was notorious for his many love affairs" (1004). Following Grossman's explanation of the Holy Office in a footnote, she recognizes the irony: "the protestations that follow here are pointedly disingenuous, for despite his being a priest, Lope de Vega's dissolute private life was common knowledge" (456). Finally, Lathrop, too, reveals in a footnote Cervantes' irony: "Cervantes knew about Lope's scandalous private life" (424). The eight translators have similar interpretations of the original, yet only Starkie, Rutherford, Grossman, and Lathrop explain the irony of Cervantes' praise for Lope de Vega.

Another example of Cervantine irony that escapes translators occurs in Part I, Chapter 9, when Cervantes expresses his strong desire to learn more about the life of Don Quijote. The discovery of two books from the sixteenth century in the knight-errant's library leaves Cervantes "desoso de saber real y verdaderamente toda la vida y milagros de nuestro famoso español don Quijote de la Mancha, luz y espejo de la caballería manchega" (178). Putnam's translation of "milagros" is not as forceful as the original, and the translation of "luz y espejo de la caballería manchega" is too literal:

desirous of knowing the real and true story, the whole story, of the life and wondrous deeds of our famous Spaniard, Don Quixote, light and mirror of the chivalry of La Mancha (81)

Cohen, with his translation "marvels," fails to recreate the irony of the "milagros." In addition, Cohen describes Don Quijote as the "light and mirror of Manchegan chivalry" (75-76). Unfortunately, Starkie's translation (107) is the same as Cohen's. ODJ, like Putnam, lessen the irony with their translation of "milagros" as "wondrous deeds;" they also describe Don Quijote as the "light and mirror of Manchegan chivalry" (66).

Raffel's translation of "milagros" captures more closely the irony:

I longed to know really and truly everything about our famous Spaniard Don Quijote's life and all his heroic exploits (51)

His translation of "luz y espejo de la caballería manchega," however, is somewhat perplexing: "the light and ornament of La Mancha knight-hood" (51). Rutherford's translation is problematic:

eager for exact and authentic knowledge of the complete life and works of our famous Spaniard Don Quijote de la Mancha, the light and mirror of the chivalry of that land (74)

Grossman's translation is accurate and expresses well the irony of Cervantes' description of his knight:

longing to know, really and truly and in its entirety, the life and miracles of our famous Spaniard Don Quixote de la Mancha, the model and paragon of Manchegan chivalry (66)

Lathrop's translation of "vida y milagros," "life and miracles," informs the reader that the phrase is ironic, but like previous translators, he describes Don Quijote as "the light and mirror of Manchegan chivalry" (64-65). While both Grossman and Lathrop recreate the ironic force of the "milagros" of the knight-errant, the best translation of the entire passage seems to be Grossman's.

A final example of irony that translators fail to translate correctly is from the Prologue to Part I. Cervantes combines serious commentary about his literary style with false modesty as he addresses those critics who say that the novel is a "leyenda seca como un esparto, ajena de invención, menguada de estilo, pobre de conceptos y falta de toda erudición y doctrina" (96). He praises in an ironic tone those authors whose books lack literary decorum: "guardando en esto un decoro tan ingenioso, que en un renglón han pintado un enamorado distraído y en otro hacen un sermoncico cristiano" (96). Putnam fails to communicate the irony with his translation "for they are so adroit at maintaining a solemn face" (12). Cohen, too, is guilty of a mistranslation, as he writes that there are "many St. Thomases or other doctors of the church, observing such an ingenious solemnity" (26). In Starkie's translation, the authors about whom Cervantes writes possess "so portentous a gravity" (42). Rutherford (12)

and Grossman (4) translate “un decoro tan ingenioso” as “ingenious decorum.” ODJ, however, translates the phrase “tan ingenioso” as Cervantes probably intended it to mean: “anyone would say they do a decorum so ingenious” (10). Raffel’s translation “just see how careful they are to stay so delicately proper” (8) and Lathrop’s “such a resourceful decorum” (4) are close, but they do not possess the irony of “so ingenious.”

While accuracy is a necessary component of a successful translation, the translator should not sacrifice a translation that makes sense in favor of one that is accurate but difficult to understand. In Part I, Chapter 2, Cervantes describes two women who are standing in front of the inn that Don Quijote approaches: “Estaban acaso a la puerta dos mujeres mozas, destas que llaman del partido...” (122). The problematic word is *partido*, which the *Diccionario de autoridades* defines as “las que son de mal vivir, vendiendo su cuerpo, que llaman comúnmente rameras.” Cohen (37), Rutherford (32), and Grossman (26) describe the women as possessing “easy virtue.” The other translations are not as polite or as ambiguous. ODJ (31) and Raffel (18) describe the women as “party girls;” Raffel underscores his translation with the addition of the word “whores.” Starkie’s (63) and Raffel’s translations “wenches” and “whores,” respectively, are, I believe, the most accurate and do not force the reader to make sense of them. Lathrop’s translation “tart” (25) is not as descriptive, but it is accurate. The most intriguing translation is Putnam’s: “of the district” (33). Unlike those of Starkie and Raffel, Putnam’s translation is ambiguous and does not capture the true nature of the women’s “profession.”

Another passage that requires translators to choose between literal accuracy and making sense is the following statement by Sancho Panza, who comments on the presence of the interpolated novel “El curioso impertinente” in Cide Hamete Benengeli’s adventures of Don Quijote and Sancho, from Part II, Chapter 3: “Yo apostaré que ha mezclado el hi de perro berzas con capachos” (57). Sancho, of course, compares the presence of the interpolated novel within the larger novel to mixing cabbage (*berzas*) with baskets (*capachos*). Not all of the translators, however, chose a translation that makes sense in lieu of one that is accurate. As a result, the reader must make sense of the translation. For example, Putnam’s and ODJ’s translations of mixing “cabbages with baskets” (620) is literal and requires the reader to ponder its significance. Although not as literal, Starkie’s translation “a pretty kettle of fish of everything” (549) is equally ambiguous. The other translations, while less accurate, make more sense: Cohen, “a fine mix-up of everything” (489); Raffel, “all sorts

of silly stuff" (378); Rutherford, "right old hotchpotch" (506); Grossman, "apples and oranges" (478); and Lathrop, "mixed everything up" (445).

There are several examples of translations that completely misrepresent the original. In Part I, Chapter II, Cervantes pokes fun at those authors who beg pardon for naming something considered unpleasant: "En esto sucedió acaso que un porquero que andaba recogiendo de unos rastrojos una manada de puercos (que, sin perdón, así se llaman)" (107). Except for Cohen, all of the translators translate correctly "sin perdón." Cohen, however, writes "pardon me for naming them" (38). Starkie is the only translator who provides the reader with an explanation of Cervantes' satire: "Even today the peasantry beg one's pardon when mentioning swine. Proximity to the Moslems, who, like the Jews, abhor pork, originated this superstition. Cervantes here ridicules the superstition" (64).

Another example of a mistaken translation is in Part II, Chapter 70, when Altisidora reacts angrily to Don Quijote's ambivalence toward her: "Oyendo lo cual Altisidora, mostrando enojarse y alterarse..." (609). Six of the eight translations translate correctly Altisidora's reaction:

Putnam:	Hearing this, Altisidora became angry and excited. (1143)
ODJ:	Hearing this, Altisidora, becoming angry and upset... (811)
Raffel:	At this, Altisidora flared up and grew angry... (728)
Rutherford:	When Altisidora heard this she bridled up... (959)
Grossman:	Hearing which, Altisidora, showing signs of anger and vexation... (916)
Lathrop:	When Altisidora heard this, she became angry and up set... (838)

Cohen's and Starkie's translations, however, are completely misleading:

Cohen:	At this Altisidora pretended to be angry and upset. (918)
Starkie:	On hearing this, Altisidora, pretending to be angry and upset... (1025)

While Altisidora did pretend to die, her anger was real and borne out of frustration. In his article, Allen cites Miguel de Unamuno's interpretation of the girl's reaction:

Mostró la liviana Altisidora que, aun en burlas y todo, le dolía el desvío de Don Quijote. Imposible es que una doncella finja en chanzas enamorarse y no lleve a mal el que no se la corresponda en veras. (5)

Putnam's and Cohen's translations can be attributed to careless attention to context and a failure to understand the meaning of the word "mostrando."

In Part I, Chapter 31, Don Quijote tells Sancho how grateful he is that he is "digno de merecer amar tan alta señora como Dulcinea del Toboso" (431). All of the translators except Starkie translate "digno de merecer amar" as "worthy of loving" or a variable of the same phrase. In Starkie's translation, however, Don Quijote is "worthy of the love" (311).

Surprisingly, the translation of the monetary unit *real* in some editions is not only misleading, but also nonsensical. In Part I, Chapter 2, Don Quijote arrives at an inn and when told that there are only several little cod to eat, the knight underscores his belief that there is no difference between eight small cods and one large one with the following analogy: "porque eso se me da que me den ocho reales en sencillos que en una pieza de a ocho" (127). According to the *Diccionario de autoridades*, a *real* is a "moneda del valor de treinta y quatro maravedis, que es la que oy se llama real de vellon." Cohen (40), Putnam (36), OJD (33), Grossman (28), and Lathrop (28) leave the word in its original form. In addition to leaving the word in its original form, Grossman includes the following footnote: "*Real* was the name given to a series of silver coins, no longer in use, which were roughly equivalent to thirty-four *maravedís*" (28). By omitting italics, Starkie substitutes the English word *real* for the Spanish monetary unit *real*:

Starkie: for it is the same to me whether I receive eight single reals
or one piece of eight (67)

The most problematic translation is Raffel's: "because I don't care if you give me ten one-dollar bills or one ten-dollar bill" (21). He defends his translation with a historically-based argument:

Linguistic history also reveals that the German word *thaler* entered Spanish *before* it entered English, being used both in Spain and in

its colonies for the Spanish “piece of eight” coin, called (after the German) a *dolar* [sic] and worth eight *reales*. It was then borrowed—strictly, re-borrowed—as a monetary term, both in Britain and, later, in its North American colonies. With this largely forgotten history in mind, therefore, the many archaic monetary terms employed by Cervantes have been reduced to one, “dollar,” well understood at that time as an English word of Spanish origin. If this in some senses a linguistic compromise, on the facts it is clearly historically legitimated. (xvii-xviii)

While the reason for the change may be supported by the word’s etymological history, the appearance of the word “dollar” in a seventeenth-century Spanish novel about a knight whose language is archaic is anachronistic. Raffel’s historical explanation, however, does not explain why he chose to change the number of *reales* from eight to ten. In addition, as Wagschal points out in his review of Raffel’s translation, “paper money—as predicated by the term “dollar bill”—was not in wide-spread use anywhere in Europe until the eighteenth century” (149). Clearly, the translators who chose to leave the word in its original form provided the readers of their respective editions with the most accurate translation.

An accurate translation of *Don Quijote* certainly requires the translator to have intimate knowledge of seventeenth-century Spanish culture, as the following sentence from the first chapter illustrates: “Una olla de algo más vaca que carnero, salpicón las más noches, duelos y quebrantos los sábados, lantejas los viernes, algún palomino de añadidura los domingos, consumían las tres partes de su hacienda” (113). The problematic words are *olla*, *salpicón*, *duelos y quebrantos*, and *de añadidura*, as they are associated with Spanish cuisine of the seventeenth century. All of the translators translated *olla*, which the *Diccionario de autoridades* defines as “la comida, o guisado, que se hace dentro de la misma olla, compuesto de carne, tocino, garbanzos y otras cosas,” as stew. The translation of *salpicón*, defined as “hambre de carne picada, compuesto y aderezado con pimienta, sal, vinagre, y cebolla, todo mezclado,” is not uniform in all of the translations. Cohen (31), ODJ (25), Grossman (19), and Lathrop (17) translate *salpicón* as “hash,” which, according to the *Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary* is “a form of minced food, usually prepared from materials previously cooked, as meat, potatoes, bread crumbs, etc., and recooked by baking or frying.” Putnam takes a more direct approach with his translation of “chopped meat” (25). Starkie and Rutherford, however, are more vague with their translations of “hodge-podge, pick-

led and cold" (56) and "leftovers," (25), respectively. Raffel's translation, "cold salt beef" (13), highlights the main ingredient in *salpicón*.

Like *salpicón*, *duelos y quebrantos* has different translations. *Duelos y quebrantos* is a typical dish of La Mancha that the *Diccionario de autoridades* defines as "tortilla de huevos y sesos." As such, the translations range from "boiled bones" (Cohen 31) to "bacon and eggs" (ODJ 25 and Lathrop 17), "lardy eggs" (Rutherford 25), and "eggs and abstinence" (Grossman 19). Starkie's intriguing translation of "tripe and trouble" (56-57) is accompanied by a footnote which explains that Saturday was a day of semi-abstinence (hence Grossman's translation) in memory of the defeat of the Moors in 1212 in the battle of Navas de Tolosa (57). The footnote further states that *duelos y quebrantos* were "rashers and eggs" and that bacon and eggs were the staple diet of La Mancha during Cervantes' lifetime. Putnam and Raffel prefer translations, "scraps" (25) and "leftover scraps" (13), respectively, that do not reflect as closely the culinary culture of La Mancha. Finally, the phrase *de añadidura* receives similar treatment by all of the translators, except Raffel, who does not make reference to it in his translation. The other translators interpret the phrase to mean something extra in a positive sense, hence the different translations can best be summarized with the following ones: "special delicacy" (Putnam 25) and "Sunday treat" (Cohen 31).

While a translation that makes sense should be the goal of any translator, so should a translation that does not make sense, if, as is the case with Cervantes, the author of the original includes nonsensical information. One example in which Cervantes confuses the reader occurs at the beginning of Part II, Chapter 24. It is at this point in the novel that the translator of Cide Hamete's original text informs the reader of the words Hamete wrote in the margin of the page that narrates the Cave of Montesinos episode:

No me puedo dar a entender, ni me puedo persuadir, que al valeroso don Quijote le pasase puntualmente todo lo que en el antecedente capítulo queda escrito: la razón es que todas las aventuras hasta aquí sucedidas han sido contingibles y verisímiles; pero ésta desta cueva no le hallo entrada alguna para tenerla por verdadera, por ir tan fuera de los términos razonables. Pues pensar yo que Don Quijote mintiese, siendo el más verdadero hidalgo y el más noble caballero de sus tiempos, no es posible; que no dijera él una mentira si le asaetearan. Por otra parte, considero que él la contó y la dijo con todas las circunstancias dichas, y que no pudo fabricar en tan breve espacio tan

gran máquina de disparates; y si esta aventura parece apócrifa, yo no tengo la culpa; y así, sin afirmarla por falsa o verdadera, la escribo. Tú, lector, pues eres prudente, juzga lo que te pareciere, que yo no debo ni puedo más; puesto que se tiene por cierto que al tiempo de su fin y muerte dicen que se retrató della, dijo que él la había inventado, por parecerle que convenía y cuadraba bien con las aventuras que había leído en sus historias. (232)

Immediately after inviting the reader to decide the veracity of Don Quijote's experience in the Cave of Montesinos, Cervantes informs the reader that "it is said" that Don Quijote confessed on his deathbed that he had invented the entire episode. Translators, therefore, must decide how to maintain the ambiguity surrounding the knight's confession. Two of the translators, though, take it upon themselves to "correct" Cervantes so that the reader is not confused:

Cohen One thing, however, is certain, that finally he retracted it on his death-bed and confessed that he had invented it (624).

Starkie's translation is similar to Cohen's:

One thing, however, is certain, that finally he retracted it on his deathbed and confessed that he had invented it (696).

Unlike Cohen and Starkie, however, the other translators recognize the third-person account ("dicen") of what Don Quijote said on his deathbed:

Putnam: It is definitely reported, however, that at the time of his death he retracted what he had said, confessing that he had invented the incident. (788)

ODJ: Some maintain, however, that at the time of his death he retracted and said he had invented it all. (558)

Raffel: though it is considered certain that there are those who allege that, on his deathbed, he took back every word of it, explaining that he had invented the entire thing. (487)

- Rutherford: even though it is believed to be the case that when he was dying he is said to have retracted it all and stated that he had made it up. (648)
- Grossman: yet it is considered true that at the time of Don Quixote's passing and death, he is said to have retracted it, saying he had invented it. (614)
- Lathrop: they say that he retracted it and said that he had invented it all. (570)

By recognizing the hearsay account of the knight's deathbed confession, the preceding translators preserve the confusing nature of Hamet's marginal notes about the Cave of Montesinos episode. As Allen notes in his article (7), it is necessary that the reader be unsure about the Cave of Montesinos episode to appreciate what Don Quijote tells Sancho at the end of Chapter 41: "Sancho, pues vos queréis que se os crea lo que habéis visto en el cielo, yo quiero que vos me creáis a mí lo que vi en la cueva de Montesinos. Y no os digo más" (373).

In his article, Allen cites examples of *double entendres* that many translators do not do justice. Surprisingly, the word *desengaño* is problematic. In Part II, Chapter 29, Sancho, after he and Don Quijote leave behind Dapple and Rocinante and sail away on the "enchanted" boat, laments abandoning the animals: "¡Oh carísimos amigos, quedaos en paz, y la locura que nos aparta de vosotros, convertida en desengaño, nos vuelva a vuestra presencia!" (275). *Desengaño*, as defined by the *Diccionario de autoridades*, is "luz de la verdad, conocimiento del error con que se sale del engaño." Translators, however, find it difficult, and in some cases impossible, to come up with a meaningful translation. Rutherford's translation of *desengaño* is the closest to the meaning of the word during Cervantes' day: "O my dearest friends, peace be with you, and let's hope the madness that's taking us from you sees the light and lets us come back to you again" (683). Putnam, ODJ, Raffel, and Lathrop seem to base their translations more on the word *locura* and its corresponding associations:

- Cohen: One thing, however, is certain, that finally he retracted it on his death-bed and confessed that he had invented it (624).

- Putnam: Peace be with you, O dearly beloved creatures! May the madness that takes us from you be turned into sound sense and bring us to back to you once more. (828)
- ODJ: O dear friends, peace be with you, and may this madness that is taking us away from you be turned into sober sense and bring us back to you. (587)
- Raffel: Oh, be calm, my dearest friends! Oh, may the madness taking us away from you be turned into sanity, and let us return! (514)
- Lathrop: Dear friends! Stay there in peace, and may the madness that is taking us away from you change to sanity and allow us to return to your presence. (602)

Cohen's, Starkie's, and Grossman's translations of the word *desengaño* have nothing whatsoever to do with its Golden Age meaning. Grossman appears to revise Cohen's translation, which he bases upon the English translation of the word *desengaño*:

Cohen: O my dearest friends, stay there in peace, and may the madness that takes us from you turn to disappointment and bring us back to your company. (658)

Grossman: O dearest friends, stay in peace, and let the madness that takes us away from you turn into disappointment and bring us back to you! (648)

Starkie's translation, while different, is equally perplexing:

O dearest friends, rest in peace, and may the folly that carries us away from you be turned to repentance and bring us back to your presence. (734)

Starkie seems to have followed Shelton's translation, "repentance" (219). While Rutherford's translation is closest to the Golden Age meaning of the word *desengaño*, Cohen's, Starkie's, and Grossman's translations are misleading.

Another *double entendre* is the word *admirado*, which describes Roque Guinart's reaction in Part II, Chapter 60 after hearing Claudia

Jerónima tell him that she murdered her fiancé: “Roque, admirado de la gallardía, bizarría, buen talle y suceso de la hermosa Claudia” (531). The verb *admirar*, according to *Autoridades*, means “mirar una cosa con espanto de su calidad, de su valor, u de su grandeza.” An appropriate translation, therefore, would be “amazed” or “astonished.” Putnam’s translation, however, has Roque “admiring” the act: “Admiring the beautiful Claudia’s dash and spirit and her charming figure, and admiring her as well for what she had done” (1070). Of course, Roque is not filled with admiration, defined in *Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary* as “wonder mingled with approbation, esteem, love, or delight, excited by something fine, skillful, beautiful, etc.” Instead, he is astonished, defined as “to stun, or strike dumb with sudden fear, terror, surprise, or wonder.” OJD also describes Roque’s reaction as “filled with admiration” (760). Grossman, like Putnam and OJD, interprets *admirado* as a favorable reaction:

Roque, marveling at the lovely Claudia’s gallantry, courage, beautiful appearance, and remarkable story (854)

Starkie’s translation of *admirado* as “impressed” (959) and Cohen’s and Raffel’s translation “struck” (858 and 679, respectively) are closer to the sensation of astonishment implied by the original. Roque in Rutherford’s translation is “amazed” (896). Lathrop’s translation is the most accurate:

Roque, astonished at the gallantry, pluck, good looks, and initiative of the beautiful Claudia (785)

Of course, the words *desengaño* and *admirado* are only two of the many *double entendres* in the novel. A faulty translation of words like these changes the original so much that the reader is unable to truly appreciate certain parts of the novel.

Translators must aspire to preserve the archaic style in which the characters speak, especially Don Quijote, but, unfortunately, a desire to appeal too much to modern readers leads some translators to omit archaisms. For example, the four earliest translations of our group (Putnam, Cohen, Starkie, and OJD) are more successful in preserving the archaic language of the following comments Don Quijote makes about Basilio’s trick to make everyone think he committed suicide in Part II, Chapter 22: “No se pueden ni deben llamar engaños los que ponen la mira en virtuosos fines” (210). In Putnam’s translation, this line becomes “Deception is not the word where aims are virtuous” (769). Cohen’s translation is

equally effective: "Deceptions they could not and should not be called seeing that they were designed for a good purpose" (608). Starkie's translation seems to be modeled after Putnam's and Cohen's: "Trick it should not be called seeing that it aimed at virtuous ends" (678). The OJD translation is perhaps the best: "Deceit is not and ought not to be the term used when the end visaged is a virtuous one" (543). In comparison, the four most recent translations do not recreate as well the archaic effect of the earlier translations:

Raffel: You really can't call it a trick, nor should you, for how can there be deceit when the ending is virtuous. (473)

Rutherford: No, nothing that is directed at a virtuous end can or should be called deception. (631)

Grossman: They cannot and should not be called deceptions since their purpose was virtuous. (597)

Lathrop: You cannot and should not call those acts that lead to honorable ends deceptions. (554)

Putnam, Cohen, Starkie, and OJD are able to produce a translation that sounds antique without altering the meaning of the content.

While there appears to be general uniformity with respect to the manner in which the different translators deal with the names of the characters, there are exceptions. In Part I, Chapter IV, Don Quijote persuades, albeit until the knight leaves, the farmer Juan Haldudo⁸ to stop whipping Andrés, the farmer's young servant. Cohen is the only translator who anglicizes the names: "Andrés" becomes "Andrew" and "Juan Haldudo" becomes "John Haldudo" (48). In Part I, Chapter 34, Cohen also anglicizes the names of the characters that appear in the interpolated story "El curioso impertinente." Thus, in Cohen's edition, "Camila" is "Camilla," "Lotario" becomes "Lothario," and "Clori" translates to "Chloris." The characters whose names would sound awkward when anglicized remain as they appear in the Spanish version: Anselmo

8 Douglas/Jones explain in a footnote that "*Haldudo* means 'skirted' or 'wearing long or full skirts.' Don Quixote takes it to be an unflattering nickname" (40). Upon hearing the name of the farmer, the knight comments, "That matters little. There may be Haldudos who are knights. Moreover, everyone is the son his works" (41). Raffel also calls attention to the significance of the farmer's last name: "[haldudo / faldudo = long-skirted]" (27).

and Leonela. It is interesting that Putnam, Starkie, ODJ, Raffel, and Rutherford translate the name of only one of the characters from the interpolated novel: "Clori" becomes "Chloris." Neither Grossman nor Lathrop, however, make this change. In Part II, Chapter 39, all of the translators except Raffel translate "Dolorida."

Putnam (902), ODJ (639), and Lathrop (657):	"Distressed One"
Cohen:	"Afflicted One" (719)
Starkie:	"Doleful One" (804)
Rutherford:	"Dolorous Duenna" (747)
Grossman:	"Dolorous One" (710)

While Putnam does not translate the name "Dolorida," he does explain its significance within the text: "Oh noble and powerful lord of lords, my name is Trifaldín the White-Bearded, and I am the Countess Trifaldí's squire, she who is also known as the Lady Dolorida [*dolorida* = of sorrows]" (556). It is not surprising that Raffel does not anglicize the name, as he states in the Introduction that he does not translate the names; instead, as he does with "Dolorida," he briefly explains their significance within brackets. In addition, the title of Raffel's translation is *Don Quijote*. With the exception of Raffel, all of the other translators use the title *Don Quixote*.

The translators cannot agree on how best to translate Cervantes' humor in the following line from Part II, Chapter 10: "Y más, que así será buscar a Dulcinea por el Toboso como a Marica por Rávena, o al bachiller en Salamanca" (105). Of course, Cervantes compares locating Dulcinea, whom neither Don Quijote nor Sancho have ever seen, to finding a needle in a haystack. Unless the reader knew that *Marica* is the diminutive of *María* and that Ravenna is a city in northern Italy, the first allusion could not be appreciated. For this reason, either an accurate translation that does not sacrifice the meaning of the phrase or a footnote is needed. Unfortunately, not all of the translators recognized the potential problems associated with a faulty translation of "Marica por Rávena:"

Putnam:	Marica in Rávena (667)
Cohen:	little Maria in Ravenna (526)
Starkie:	needle in a haystack (590)
ODJ:	María in Ravenna (473)

Raffel:	one Marica out of all the Maricas in Ravenna (408)
Rutherford:	a girl called María in Madrid (544)
Grossman:	María in Ravenna (515)
Lathrop:	Marica in Ravenna (480)

Putnam, Cohen, ODJ, and Grossman rely on the reader's knowledge to understand their translations. Starkie, Raffel, and Rutherford provide more explanatory translations; Starkie's, however, ignores completely the cultural content of Cervantes' allusion. While Lathrop's translation is similar to Putnam's, Lathrop provides for the reader a lengthy footnote that explains the meaning of "Marica in Ravenna:"

Ravenna is that city in northern Italy, near the Adriatic Sea, south of Venice and east of Bologna. *Marica* is an affectionate diminutive for *María*. But wouldn't it be easy to find lots of Maricas in Ravenna? (480)

With respect to the comparison of finding "Dulcinea por el Toboso" to locating "al bachiller en Salamanca," there exist subtle misinterpretations. According to the *Diccionario de autoridades*, *bachiller* is "El primer grado que se da en las Universidades a los que han oído y estudiado alguna facultad: como Artes, Teología, Leyes, Cánones, Medicina, después de haber cursado en ellas el tiempo determinado para recibirle." An accurate translation, therefore, is one that reflects the idea of a college graduate or at least a student. An endnote accompanies Putnam's translation, "bachelor in Salamanca" (667): "Salamanca was full of bachelors of arts" (1177). Cohen (526), ODJ (473), Grossman (515), and Lathrop (II, 10) translate *bachiller* as "bachelor." Without an explanatory footnote, the comparison becomes finding a Dulcinea in Toboso with locating a bachelor, or an unmarried man, in Salamanca. This meaning, however, clearly was not Cervantes' intention. The other translations are more accurate:

Starkie:	scholar in Salamanca (590)
Raffel:	college graduate in Salamanca (408)
Rutherford:	student in Salamanca (545)

The *princeps*, as Allen notes (214), has the *primo* from Part II, Chapter 24 referred to as *sobrino* at the end of the chapter. Only a few

of the translators, however, acknowledge this contradiction. Putnam translates this character's identity as "cousin" (793), but he also includes a note: "The original has *sobrino*"—"nephew," an obvious slip on Cervantes' part" (1187). A slip? Lathrop identifies the character as "nephew" (574), and he, too, explains the confusion surrounding this character's name:

Nephew has been *cousin* to this point. Schevill keeps it, but says that is "carelessness on the part of Cervantes for *cousin*. It is not carelessness at all, but rather just another contradiction built into the work. Readers who delve into the books of chivalry will find the same carelessness that Cervantes IS IMITATING here. Most editors make the change back to cousin without comment, some keep *nephew* and state that it *should be cousin*. (574)

Those editors who "make the change back to cousin" include Starkie (702), ODJ (562), Raffel (491), Rutherford (653), and Grossman (619). Cohen ignores the discrepancy altogether. Instead of *cousin* or *nephew*, Cohen identifies the character as *scholar* (629). In Part II, Chapter 22, an inexplicable transformation takes place in Cohen's translation: the *cousin* (610) becomes *guide* (611), and, then, *scholar* (611).

Another example of how translators deal with names is the translation of the poems by the Académicos de la Argamasilla, Part I, Chapter 52. Since many academicians of Cervantes' day had literary pseudonyms, the burlesque names of the academicians of Argamasilla de Alba, a town forty-two miles east of Ciudad Real that did not have an Academy, must have been a source of amusement. The names as they appear in the original are Monicongo, Paniaguado, Caprichoso, Burlador, Cachidiablo, and Tiquitoc. Putnam (540-43) and ODJ (403-05) do not alter the names. Putnam, however, explains the meaning of them:

Paniaguado: "The name signifies a parasite or hanger-on."

Caprichoso: "The meaning is whimsical, crotchety."

Burlador: "The name means jester."

Cachidiablo: "Signifying hobgoblin."

Tiquitoc: "The name is onomatopoeic." (573)

Cohen, Starkie, Rutherford, and Grossman translate the names:

Cohen: Mumbo Jumbo, The Good Companion, Whimsical Will, The Joker, The Hobgoblin, Ding-Dong (458-60)

Starkie: Priggish, Toady, Crotchety, Playboy, Hobgoblin, Ding-Dong
(515-17)

Unlike the translators who change all of the names, both Raffel and Lathrop translate only the names whose translation represents accurately the original:

Raffel: Monicongo, Paniaguado, Whimsy, Practical Joker, The Devil's Own,
Ticky-Tocky (352-55)

Lathrop: Monicongo, Paniaguado, Caprichoso, Jokester, Cachidiablo,
Tiquitoc (412-414)

In addition, Lathrop, as he does throughout his entire translation, facilitates the reader's comprehension of the Spanish text by including a footnote that explains the significance of Monicongo: "This is the old name for the Congo (modern République Démocratique du Congo, formerly Zaire" 412,).

The title of the academician Paniaguado's poem in the first edition of the novel is "In Laudem Dulcineæ del Doboso." All of the translators except Lathrop correct this supposed mistake and change the problematic word to "Toboso." Lathrop, however, insists on maintaining the original spelling and informs the reader in a footnote that "the first edition *did* say "Doboso." It could be an amusing error-on-purpose by Cervantes. Virtually all editors and translators "correct" this, mostly without saying so."

The time period in which a translator lived and his country of origin affect the language and tone of a translation. For example, a translator who lives in the United States in 2007 will produce quite a different version than a translator who lived in Great Britain a century ago. For this reason, readers must be aware of a translator's background with respect to her life and her country of origin. All of the translators of the English versions of *Don Quijote* since 1949 are from the United States, except Cohen, Starkie, and Rutherford, who are British. A person from Iowa, for example, who reads Rutherford's translation probably would find the vocabulary difficult to understand. In Part II, Chapter 63, the narrator describes Sancho's reaction upon seeing the half-naked galley rowers:

Sancho, que vio tanta gente en cueros, quedó pasmado, y más cuando vio hacer tienda con tanta priesa, que a él le pareció que todos los diablos andaban allí trabajando; pero esto todo fueron tortas y pan pintado para lo que ahora diré. (558)

According to the *Diccionario de autoridades*, *tortas y pan pintado* is an “expression familiar con que se advierte a alguno, que se siente o queja de pequeño trabajo, que habrá de sufrir, o tener otros mayores.” The line “pero esto todo fueron tortas y pan pintado para lo que ahora diré” in Rutherford’s translation reads as “But this was small beer compared to what I shall narrate next” (918). Small beer? Cohen and Starkie, whose translations appeared in 1950 and 1964, respectively, chose to express Rutherford’s “small beer” as “tarts and gingerbread” (879 and 982, respectively). In comparison, the translations that appeared within the last twenty-five years from American translators read in this manner:

ODJ: but all this was nothing to what I am going to tell now.
(778)

Raffel: but all of this was child’s play, compared to what I’ll tell you next. (696)

Grossman’s translation is very similar to Raffel’s:

but this was mere child’s play compared to what I shall tell you now. (876)

Lathrop: But all this was nothing compared to what I’ll now relate.
(804)

Readers from the United States should have no problems understanding the American translators’ translations of “*tortas y pan pintado*.” Since the translators are from the same country and the same time period, their vocabulary is similar. What happens when the translators are from the same country but different time periods? Putnam’s translation, published in 1949, is very different from the ones by ODJ, Raffel, Grossman, and Lathrop:

Putnam: This, however, was but gingerbread and cakes compared to what I am about to tell you now. (1095)

Another example of the British slant of Rutherford’s translation is from Part II, Chapter 66, when Sancho arbitrates a race, described to Sancho by a farmer, between a fat man and a thin man: “Es, pues, el caso—dijo el

Labrador—, señor bueno, que un vecino deste lugar, tan gordo, que pesa once arrobas, desafió a correr a otro su vecino, que no pesa más que cinco” (582). The *Diccionario de autoridades* defines *arroba* as “pesa de veinte y cinco libras de a diez y seis onzas cada una.” Rutherford translates the farmer’s narration using vocabulary to describe the race participants’ weights that would surely confuse American readers:

Well, it’s just this, good sir, said the farmer. One of the villagers, who’s so fat he weighs twenty stone, has challenged another man, a neighbour of his, who only weighs nine stone, to a race. (936)

A stone is the equivalent of fourteen pounds. In contrast, the ODJ and Raffle translations describe the men’s weights in pounds (793 and 710, respectively). Surprisingly, not all of the American translators list the weight of the men using pounds. Putnam does not translate “arrobas,” but he does include an endnote to explain the term: “The arroba being twenty-five pounds, the fat man’s weight was two hundred and seventy-five” (1220). Both Grossman and Lathrop leave the word “arrobas” in its original form (895 and 819, respectively). Grossman, however, does not explain the significance of the word, while Lathrop defines it in a footnote. Like Rutherford, Cohen, too, uses the term *stone* (897). Starkie, however, does not change the unit of measure from its original, nor does he provide an explanation of its meaning (1001).

Translators of *Don Quijote* aspire to an impossible goal: a perfect rendering of one of the most complex and ingenious novels ever written. In order to do so, however, a translation of the novel must make sense, both linguistically and culturally, to the reader. For this reason, a reader must consider, when selecting a translation, the year in which the translation first appeared and the translator’s country of origin. The explanatory notes like the ones found in Putnam’s and Lathrop’s translations are necessary; readers not familiar with Spanish or seventeenth-century Spanish culture, for example, require additional information. The absence of footnotes and endnotes, in my opinion, hinders the reader’s appreciation of the novel.

In addition to making sense, an English translation of *Don Quijote* must recreate the literary tropes of the original, as they are an integral aspect of the genius of the novel. Unfortunately, Cohen and Starkie tend to miss Cervantes’ irony and satire, and, consequently, their translations are misleading and deprive the reader of the author’s true intentions. While all of the translations, some more than others, offer a glimpse of

the genius of *Don Quijote*, I recommend to anyone who desires a true appreciation of the novel the translations by ODJ and Lathrop. As scholars of Spain's Golden Age, and especially Cervantine literature, Jones and Lathrop possess the knowledge to write an informative translation that appeals to today's readers and the insight to recreate with accuracy the language, the literary tropes, and the history and culture of Cervantes' day.

Department of Foreign Languages
P.O. Box 8081
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, GA 30460
mmcgrath@georgiasouthern.edu

WORKS CITED

- Allen, John Jay. "Traduttori Traditori: *Don Quixote* in English." *Crítica Hispánica* 1.1 (1979): 1-13.
- Byron, George Gordon. *Don Juan*. Ed. and with an introduction and notes by Leslie A. Marchand. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *The Adventures of Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Trans. Charles Jervas. 1742. London and New York: Routledge, n.d.
- . *The Adventures of Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Trans. J[ohn] M[ichael] Cohen. 1950. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1975.
- . *Don Quijote*. Fourth-Centenary Translation. Trans. and with notes by Tom Lathrop. Illustrated by Jack Davis. Newark, DE: European Masterpieces, 2005.
- . *Don Quijote*. Trans. Burton Raffel. [Introduction by Diana de Armas Wilson. New York: W. W. Norton, 1995.] *A New Translation. Backgrounds and Contexts. Criticism*. Edited by Diana de Armas Wilson. 1998. New York: W. W. Norton, 1999.
- . *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. John J. Allen. 25th ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 2005.
- . *Don Quixote of la Mancha*. Translated and with an Introduction by Walter Starkie. New York: New American Library, 1964.
- . *Don Quixote. The Ormsby Translation, Revised. Backgrounds and Sources. Criticism*. Edited by Joseph R. Jones and Kenneth Douglas. New York: W. W. Norton, 1981.
- . *The First Part of the Delightful History of the Most Ingenious Knight Don Quixote of the Mancha*. Trans. Thomas Shelton. New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1960.
- . *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha. A new translation from the*

- Spanish, with a Critical Text Based on the First Editions of 1605 and 1615, and with Variant Readings, Variorum Notes, and an Introduction by Samuel Putnam.* New York: Random House, 1949.
- . *The Ingenious Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha.* Trans. John Rutherford, with an Introduction by Roberto González Echevarría. 2000 (without the Introduction). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 2001.
- Lo Ré, Anthony G. "Introduction." *A Facsimile Edition of the First English Translations of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra's El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha 1605-1615.* Thomas Shelton, Part I, London, 1612. Leonardo Digges, Part II, London 1620. Chapel Hill: n.p. [distributed by the Bull's Head Bookshop], 2002. 7-49.
- . "Las primeras ediciones inglesas de *Don Quixote*, 1612-1620." *Actas del Segundo Coloquio Internacional de la Asociación de Cervantistas.* Barcelona: Anthropos, 1991. 541-51.
- . "The Putative Shelton *Quixote* Part II, 1620, with Leonard Digges as the Likely Candidate." Anthony G. Lo Ré. *Essays on the Periphery of the Quixote.* Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta. 1991. 28-44.
- Ormsby, John. "Translator's Preface." 1885. 7 Jan. 2007 <<http://gutenberg.com/eBooks/Adelaide/c/c41d/preface1.html>> [incomplete and without notes].
- Real Academia Española. [*Diccionario de la lengua española.* 6 vols. 1726-39.] *Diccionario de autoridades.* 3 vols. 1963-64. Madrid: Gredos, 1979. Available in different format at <<http://www.rae.es>> (23 March 2007).
- Rico, Francisco. "A pie de imprentas. Páginas y noticias de Cervantes viejo." *Bulletin Hispanique* 104 (2002): 673-702.
- Wagschal, Steven. Review of *Don Quijote: A New Translation, Backgrounds, Contexts and Criticism.* By Miguel de Cervantes. Trans. Burton Raffel. Ed. Diana de Armas Wilson. *Cervantes* 21.1 (2001): 147-52. 27 Nov. 2005 <<http://www.hnet.org/~cervantes/csa/artics01/wagschal.pdf>>.
- Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary.* 2nd edition. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.
- Wolfe, Bertram D. "The Laughter and Sanity of Don Quixote; This Year Marks the 400th Anniversary of a Genius, Cervantes." *New York Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review* 17 Aug. 1947: 1-2.