

## The Text of *Don Quixote* as Seen by its Modern English Translators

DANIEL EISENBERG

---

LIKE THE EDITOR OF a text, a translator is creating a text as well. The translator must, of course, choose a text (or perhaps multiple versions of a text) in the original language. Given the heated debate over the text of *Don Quixote* during the last thirty years, and the lack of a general consensus about which of the several competing editions is most worthy of use,<sup>1</sup> it may be helpful to examine how the translators have approached the question of the work's text. As will be seen, some are aware of the problems and carefully explain how they have handled the text, while others are less informative or seemingly ignorant of the whole situation. First the translations will be reviewed chronologically; then we will examine how the translators have handled some key textual points.

The earliest translators are the ones who go into the greatest depth about textual questions. John Ormsby is the earliest translator (1885) whose version is still in current use, free for the taking on the Internet, though without his careful notes and with his Introduction much abbreviated.<sup>2</sup> He comments on the process of establishing an accurate text: "The London edition of 1738, commonly called Lord Carteret's from having been suggested by him, was not a mere edition de luxe. It produced *Don Quixote* in becoming form as regards paper and type, and

---

<sup>1</sup> I recommend the use of Rico's edition, by far the most painstaking and best documented; see my review article "Rico, por Cervantes."

<sup>2</sup> To my knowledge no English translation other than Ormsby is available on the Internet, whether for sale or for free downloading.

embellished with plates which, if not particularly happy as illustrations, were at least well intentioned and well executed, but it also aimed at correctness of text, a matter to which nobody except the editors of the Valencia and Brussels editions had given even a passing thought; and for a first attempt it was fairly successful, for though some of its emendations are inadmissible, a good many of them have been adopted by all subsequent editors" (53). As for the Spanish text he uses, "the text I have followed generally is Hartzzenbusch's. But Hartzzenbusch, though the most scholarly of the editors and commentators of *Don Quixote*, is not always an absolutely safe guide. His text is preferable to that of the Academy in being, as far as the First Part is concerned, based upon the first of La Cuesta's three editions, instead of the third, which the Academy took as its basis on the supposition (an erroneous one, as I have shown elsewhere) that it had been corrected by Cervantes himself. His emendations are frequently admirable" (11). In his notes he occasionally comments on textual questions,<sup>3</sup> and, as the above quote states, he takes a position on a debated textual point, the validity of the corrections in the edition of 1608.<sup>4</sup> This is as much information as Ormsby gives us about his text, but his notes confirm that he consulted multiple editions, as was also stated by Joseph Jones (ix), whose revision of Ormsby will be mentioned shortly.

Samuel Putnam (1949) is of all the English translators the one who shows the most sensitivity, and gives us the most information about competing editions of the Spanish text. He tells us (xvii) that "one of the most important accomplishments of the modern specialist has been a reconstruction of the text of the first editions, such as that achieved by Professor Schevill. In the past the best of the English-language translators of *Don Quixote* have had a very unsatisfactory text from which to work and too often have relied upon later printings and the 'emendations' to be found in them; whereas the principle followed by textual critics of today, as in the case of this work, is the one laid down by Schevill, to the effect that the first editions are to be treated with the same reverence as if they were the original manuscript itself and must accordingly be employed as

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, I: 127 n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Ormsby opposed giving authority to the 1608 corrections. In his Appendix III, "Bibliography of *Don Quixote*," he states that Cervantes "was not even aware of any such corrections having been made. The 1608 edition has no right to the position that has been claimed for it" (4: 411). Recently, Rico has reopened the question and defends the value of these corrections.

the scientific base for any edition—and this applies to any translation as well—that aims at being definitive.” This lengthy sentence has two footnotes. The first, following “‘emendations’ to be found in them,” reads: “Such emendations, for instance, as are to be found in the edition of Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch (1863), an editor whom Ormsby often follows. Hartzenbusch performed a valuable service by calling attention to the textual differences between the first and later editions, pointing out that these were not due to corrections made by the author; but he then proceeded to emend the first-edition text upon the basis of what he believed Cervantes “must have” written. Numerous examples of this will be found in the notes to the present translation” (467). The second footnote, at the end of the sentence, refers the reader to the preface to Schevill’s edition.<sup>5</sup>

The above quotation is part of a review of recent Cervantine scholarship, and includes a statement that “It is Schevill’s reconstructed text that has been used as a base for this translation; where another reading has been adopted the fact has been noted and the explanation given. Other important variants that have a bearing upon the English version will also be found” (xviii, also xxiv). One could not ask more of a translator so far as the Spanish text used.

Putnam includes more documentation of his work than any other translator. An extensively annotated bibliography, extending to seven pages of note-sized type (1037–1043), includes “List of the Principal English-Language Translations of *Don Quixote*,” “Principal Spanish Editions Made Use of in the Preparation of this Translation,” “Early Spanish Editions of *Don Quixote* Referred to in the Notes,” “Continental Translations of *Don Quixote* Cited in the Notes to this Version,” and “A List of the Principal Commentators and Lexicographers Cited in the Notes to this Translation.”

J. M. Cohen (1950), translator of the first Penguin Classics edition, has a “Translator’s Introduction” of 9 pages, but says not a word about the Spanish text he has used.

---

<sup>5</sup> This important edition is part of the edition of Cervantes’ complete works published at their own expense by the editors Rudolph Schevill and Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín (1914–1941). That Putnam knew that the *Don Quijote* edition, which has on the title pages the names of both Schevill and his deceased collaborator Bonilla, was the product of Schevill alone indicates a considerable familiarity with the world of Cervantine scholarship. That Putnam knew that there were competing editions of Francisco Rodríguez Marín in the market simultaneously, and knew their chronology (1039), also reveals expertise.

Walter Starkie (1964)<sup>6</sup> has an “Introduction” of 6 pages, but it also does not refer to the Spanish text. In notes he refers to Bowle (69 n. 2), Clemencín (60 n. 6), and Schevill (221 n. 3).

In 1981 there appeared a revised version of Ormsby, without his lengthy introduction or notes. It was begun by Kenneth Douglas, a French scholar. After his death in an accident, the *cervantista* Joseph Jones completed his work, adding explanatory footnotes and 170 pages of supplementary material for the university student. The “Preface” (ix–xii) is signed by Jones alone. Known as the Ormsby-Douglas-Jones translation (henceforth: ODJ), it was widely used until it was suddenly and—for some—unfortunately replaced by the Raffel translation. The back cover states that “recent textual scholarship has been taken into account [by Jones] in preparing the revisions; a detailed discussion of the procedures and principles followed is offered in the Preface.” Unfortunately there is no detailed discussion, nor any discussion at all, of these matters in the Preface. The only allusion to textual questions found there is the statement that Douglas had intended “to compare [Ormsby’s translation] with the Spanish original later, when he reviewed the Riquer edition of *Don Quixote* for scholarly improvements since Ormsby’s day. Unfortunately, his death intervened” (x). Nevertheless, Jones is one of the two translators who were known as Cervantes scholars prior to the their translation projects (Lathrop is the other), and it may be safely assumed that Jones consulted multiple editions and was aware of their textual differences.

This translation was designated by its publisher as a “Norton Critical Edition,” though textual scholars will squirm at the misuse of the term “critical edition” (see Kirby), and Jones correctly makes no such claim.

The translation by Burton Raffel was uniquely anticipated by an article, “Translating Cervantes: *Una vez más*,” published in this journal (a chapter from a then-forthcoming book, *The Art of Translating Prose*). He was answered in a Letter to the Editor by James Parr, who, in a blatant display of the lack of cordiality so frequently found in Cervantine

---

6 According to Edward Friedman, who has prefaced the modern reprint of Starkie, the unabridged translation first appeared in 1964. It was preceded by abridged versions in 1954 and 1957. On my copy of the 1957 edition (“sixth printing, November 1962”), there is an offer of an LP of Starkie reading his translation, reduced from \$5.95 to \$2.98.

studies, called it a “puff-piece,” saying that Raffel “should struggle for accuracy rather than revision.” Raffel responded in another Letter to the Editor, defending his efforts and commenting in passing on Parr’s lack of manners. In none of these, however, is there any comment on the text.

Raffel’s translation first appeared in 1995, with an “Introduction” by the Cervantes scholar Diana de Armas Wilson. In the “Translator’s Note,” as published in the paperback version of 1996, Raffel states that he used the edition “by Martín de Riquer (Planeta, 1980); I have consulted, though less frequently, the edition by Luis Andrés Murillo (Clásicos Castalia)” (xviii). He also says that his translation had benefitted from a “sensitive, intelligent, wonderfully detailed vetting of the entire manuscript” by the scholar and former *Cervantes* editor John J. Allen (xviii). This edition was reviewed in *Cervantes* by Alan Burch.

In 1999 Raffel’s translation replaced ODJ and became the “Norton Critical Edition,” now edited by Diana de Armas Wilson. It should be noted that while Douglas and Jones were editing a translation published in 1885, Wilson is editing a translation published in 1995. In what has now become the “Editor’s Introduction” she refers to the extensive errors in the prior version, crediting Michael McGaha, the other former editor of this journal, with “a long and useful list of *errata* in the trade version of this translation” (xvi). The supplementary material for the university student is completely redone, though reduced to 100 pages.

In 2000 another series replaced its translation: that of John Rutherford supplanted the venerable work of Cohen in the Penguin Classics series.<sup>7</sup> In 2001 an introduction by Roberto González Echevarría was added. Following his essay on “Translating *Don Quixote*” (xxv–xxxii of the 2001 edition), his own dedication (xxxiii), and a chronology of Cervantes’ life (xxxv–xxxvii), Rutherford includes “A Note on the Text” (xxxix–xl). He used the edition of Luis Murillo—correctly described as a “useful modern edition” (xxxix)—except for relocating of the theft of the donkey to Chapter 25. The latter is correctly described as an innovation of Hartzenbusch, followed by “several modern editors” (xxxix)<sup>8</sup> He states

---

7 In “Translating Fun: *Don Quixote*” Rutherford discusses the shortcomings of Cohen’s translation. More briefly, he comments on the translations of Raffel and Grossman: “our three *Quixotes* are clearly distinguished from each other by our different readings of Cervantes’ text and by our consequently different aims and achievements” (page not given since I consulted an electronic file supplied by author).

8 The first editor since Hartzenbusch to relocate the donkey theft was John J.

that there are other “less important inconsistencies in the early editions. Some chapter headings, for example, don’t belong to the chapters that they precede. I have left all these, without comment, for readers to spot and ponder on for themselves” (xxxix). Finally, he was able to make “important corrections” (xl) when the 1998 edition of Rico appeared. In response to an invitation—extended to all the recent translators—to contribute to this issue of *Cervantes*, he directed me to six articles that he has published concerning his and prior translations.

The most textually ignorant of the modern translators is Edith Grossman (2003). She states that she “chose to use Martín de Riquer’s edition of *Don Quixote*” because it “is based on the first printing of the book (with all its historic slips and errors)” (xviii), and refers to it in notes (50 n. 16, 376 n. 1, 434 n. 1, 657 n. 3). She does not specify which of Riquer’s editions she uses, blissfully unaware that he has published two quite different ones, the older and better known Clásicos Z edition, available under a number of imprints, and the corrected edition of 1989, published only by Planeta. Textual evidence, however, reveals that she has used the older edition only.<sup>9</sup> Also, there is to my knowledge no edition of the twentieth or twenty-first centuries that does not claim to be based on the first printing, although despite this vaunted fidelity there are important differences in the authority given to its readings.<sup>10</sup>

Grossman’s translation is reviewed in this issue by Lathrop.<sup>11</sup>

Thomas Lathrop is the only translator to have edited the Spanish text—to my knowledge, the only editor to have translated *Don Quixote* into any language—and the only one to have published scholarship on the textual problems of the work. Lathrop’s textual position, which I have debated publicly and successfully with him, is that most items which appear to be errors in the text—the disappearance and reappearance of Sancho’s donkey, the missing or incorrect chapter titles, and so on—were put there deliberately by Cervantes.<sup>12</sup> There is no translator more aware

---

Allen, in 1977.

9 A comparison of her p. 657 (see Example 9 in the tables at the end of this article) with the two editions of Riquer shows that she has used only the first of them.

10 On fidelity to the first edition, see Rico, “*Quijotes del Siglo XX*,” in the previous issue of this journal.

11 Grossman declined an invitation to review Lathrop’s translation, or to contribute in any other way to this issue, other than to authorize including her “Translator’s Note to the Reader.”

12 This debate has been transcribed and will appear shortly in both English and

of the problems in the Spanish text.

Lathrop's translation is of course based on the text of his edition. The translation first appeared in 2005, although this printing was withdrawn shortly after publication and is now a collector's item. A much revised second printing was released in 2007. Lathrop explains in the Introduction that his translation was based on his own edition, published in 1997, "which itself was based on the carefully done old-spelling edition of Schevill and Bonilla." He states that he used a facsimile of "an original 1605 Juan de la Cuesta printing," presumably accompanied by the 1615 printing of Part II, and goes on to specify many other modern editions used.

In 6 pages of the introduction (x–xv), which are taken from the introduction to his edition (xvi–xxii), Lathrop explains his position concerning what others consider errors of Cervantes' text. The most important of these are the erroneous or missing chapter titles and the mysterious theft and recovery of Sancho's donkey. As he has argued in more detail elsewhere, Tom believes these are not errors but were done deliberately by Cervantes.<sup>13</sup>

In 2006 there appeared an apparently self-published translation by James H. Montgomery, which I learned of by chance<sup>14</sup> and purchased on Amazon. His publisher wrote me that "Hackett Publishing has contracted with Mr. Montgomery to publish a revised version of the Don Quixote translation you obtained through Amazon; the latter should remain in print until the Hackett edition (which in addition to including a revision of the translation will also have a newly commissioned Introduction) is published, hopefully in March 2009" (Rak).<sup>15</sup> The publisher forwarded my letter to Montgomery, who wrote me on January 5, 2008 that he

---

Spanish. An mp3 audio file is also available; for references, see Eisenberg and Lathrop in the list of Works Cited.

<sup>13</sup> See (in order of publication) "Por qué," "Contradictions in the *Quijote* Explained," "Contradictions or Typical Exaggerations," "In Laudem," "The Mysterious Missing Title," and "Un cajista." On the controversy provoked by Lathrop's position, in addition to the debate cited in the previous note, see Ruiz Mantilla; I am grateful to Lathrop for making this article available.

<sup>14</sup> While checking an online database for recent material on Cervantes, I found that a letter of Montgomery, entitled "Translating Cervantes," had appeared in the *Times Literary Supplement*. In it, he replies to a criticism of his translation, signed "J. C."

<sup>15</sup> I would like to thank Edward Friedman for putting me in contact with Montgomery's publisher.

had used Vicente Gaos's 1987 edition as his primary text, supplemented by consultation of a 1955 edition of Riquer and the 1947-49 edition of Rodríguez Marín.

### EXAMPLES

The following tables illustrate how the various translations handle some difficult or questionable points in the text, about which the Spanish editions disagree. An asterisk indicates that the translator comments on the textual problem in a note. It is beyond the scope of this article to explore the history of these points. Rico's "Aparato crítico" will direct the *curioso* to earlier scholarship on each.

Following the examples there are some conclusions.

---

#### EXAMPLE 1: Quexana/Quixana (Part I, Chapter 1)

---

By verisimilar conjectures, the text says, one could conclude that Don Quijote's last name was "Quexana" (in the first edition), corrected to "Quixana" in Cuesta's second edition. The modern spellings are "Quejana" and "Quijana."

Ormsby	Quixana (1: 105)
Putnam	Quejana (26)
Cohen	Quexana (31)
Starkie	Quixana (57)
ODJ	Quexana (25)
Raffel	Quejana (13)
Rutherford	Quexana (25)
Grossman	Quexana (20)
Lathrop	Quejana (17)
Montgomery	Quejana (8)



---

 EXAMPLE 2: Florimorte de Hircania (Part I, Chapter 6)
 

---

Among the books in Don Quixote's library is a romance of chivalry commonly referred to as *Felixmarte de Hircania*, which is the protagonist's name specified on the book's title page. There are seven references to the protagonist or book as "Felixmarte" in the text of *Don Quijote*: Part I, chapters 13, 32 (four times), and 49; Part II, Chapter I. The first reference to it, however, is by the name "Florimorte," which is an error, although whether the error was that of Cervantes, Cervantes' character, or the typesetter is debated. Early editions also read "Florimonte" and "Florismarte." "Florismarte" is the first name of the protagonist in the work himself, before his name is changed to "Felixmarte," and this is the form used in most later Spanish editions.

Ormsby	*Florismarte (1: 155)
Putnam	*Florismarte (53)
Cohen	Florismarte (58)
Starkie	Florismarte (87)
ODJ	Florismarte (49)
Raffel	Florismarte (35)
Rutherford	*Florismarte (53)
Grossman	Felixmarte (47)
Lathrop	*Florimorte (47)
Montgomery	Florismarte (30)

---

 EXAMPLE 3: The Title of Chapter 10 of Part I
 

---

The title of Chapter 10 of Part I refers to don Quijote's battle with the *vizcaíno*, which has already finished, and of his encounter with some *yangüeses*, who do not appear in the work until Chapter 15. In the eighteenth century the Spanish Real Academia created a title that corresponds to the content of Chapter 10.

Ormsby	New title (1: 196)
Putnam	New title (75)
Cohen	New title (79)
Starkie	New title (111)
ODJ	*New title (69)
Raffel	New title (54)
Rutherford	Original title (78)
Grossman	*Original title (70)
Lathrop	Original title (69)
Montgomery	*New title (48)

---

 EXAMPLE 4: The theft of Sancho's donkey (Part I, Chapter 23 or 25)
 

---

In the first edition of Part I, Sancho's donkey mysteriously disappears and reappears, without explanation. In the second authorized (Cuesta) edition, also of 1605, passages are added explaining the theft and recovery of the donkey. The first passage is inserted at the "wrong" place in the text, Chapter 23, and the donkey remains present for two more chapters after the theft is described. Some editors move the theft of the donkey to Chapter 25, after the last reference to it as present.<sup>16</sup> The disappearing donkey problem is discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 of Part II.

Ormsby	*Omitted (1: 378)
Putnam	*Included in Chapter 23, in brackets (178–79)
Cohen	*Included in Chapter 23 (182–83)
Starkie	*Included in Chapter 23 (220–21)
ODJ	*Included in note to Chapter 23 (161)
Raffel	*Omitted (153)
Rutherford	Included in Chapter 25 (210)
Grossman	*Omitted (174, 196)
Lathrop	*Included in note to Chapter 23 (166–67)
Montgomery	*Included in Chapter 23, in brackets and italics (126–27)

---

<sup>16</sup> According to a statement of the editor John J. Allen that neither I nor Allen have been able to document, this was the change in *Don Quixote's* text that the late E. C. Riley most wanted to see. Allen does include the text in Chapter 25.

This textual problem is discussed in Chapter 4 of Part II of *Don Quijote*. In "El rucio de Sancho," I have discussed this discussion and its implication for dating.

---

EXAMPLE 5: The labyrinth of Perseus (Part I, Chapter 25)

---

Don Quijote refers to the labyrinth of Perseus. Later editions correct this to Theseus.

Ormsby	Theseus (2: 24)
Putnam	*Perseus (209)
Cohen	Theseus (213)
Starkie	Theseus (252)
ODJ	Theseus (187)
Raffel	*Perseus (159)
Rutherford	Perseus (219)
Grossman	*Perseus (204)
Lathrop	*Perseus (192)
Montgomery	*Perseus (150)

---

EXAMPLE 6: Antonio (Part I, Chapter 42)

---

In the “Tale of Ill-Advised Curiosity,” in the first edition the name of Antonio mistakenly appears instead of Cardenio.

Ormsby	Cardenio (2: 262)
Putnam	Cardenio (380)
Cohen	Cardenio (381)
Starkie	*Cardenio (431)
ODJ	Cardenio (335)
Raffel	Cardenio (291)
Rutherford	Cardenio (395)
Grossman	Cardenio (368)
Lathrop	*Cardenio (341)
Montgomery	Fernando (274)

---

 EXAMPLE 7: The title of Part I, Chapter 43
 

---

In the first edition, a long Chapter 42 is followed by Chapter 44, although the table of contents does supply a title and folio number for Chapter 43.

Ormsby	Included (2: 272)
Putnam	Included (387)
Cohen	Included (387)
Starkie	Included (438)
ODJ	Included (340)
Raffel	Included (296)
Rutherford	Included (401)
Grossman	Included (374)
Lathrop	Omitted; found in Table of Contents at end of Part I (418)
Montgomery	Included (279)

---

 EXAMPLE 8: Vicente de la Rosa/Roca (Part I, Chapter 51)
 

---

A character in the story told in this chapter twice is “Vicente de la Rosa”; the third time his name is mentioned it is “de la Roca.”<sup>17</sup>

Ormsby	Roca, Roca, Roca (2: 368–370)
Putnam	Rosa, Rosa, Rosa (449–50)
Cohen	Roca, Roca, Roca (446–48)
Starkie	Roca, Roca, Roca (503–05)
ODJ	Rosa, Rosa, Rosa (393–94)
Raffel	Rosa, Rosa, Rosa (343–44)
Rutherford	Rosa, Rosa, Rosa (463–65)
Grossman	*Rosa, Rosa, Rosa (434–36)
Lathrop	*Rosa, Rosa, Roca (401–02)
Montgomery	Rosa, Rosa, Rosa (323–25)

---

<sup>17</sup> According to Lathrop in “Un cajista,” Clemencín, Rodríguez Marín, and Valbuena Prat use “Roca” three times, Riquer, Casaldueiro, and Murillo use “Rosa” three times, and Avallé-Arce, Gaos, Ferreras, Sevilla Arroyo/Rey Hazas and Lathrop include both forms.

---

 EXAMPLE 9: Dulcinea del Doboso (Part I, concluding verses)
 

---

The heading of one of the poems at the end of Part I declares that it was written “in laudem Dulcineæ del Doboso.” The town she is from is, of course, El Toboso.

Ormsby	IN LAUDEM DULCINEÆ DEL TOBOSO (2: 385)
Putnam	in laudem Dulcineae del Toboso (461)
Cohen	IN LAUDEM DULCINEAE DEL TOBOSO (459)
Starkie	IN LAUDEN [sic] DULCINEAE OF EL TOBOSO (516)
ODJ	in laudem Dulcineæ Del Toboso (403)
Raffel	in praise of Dulcinea del Toboso (353)
Rutherford	IN LAUDEM DULCINEAE DEL TOBOSO (476)
Grossman	In Laudem Dulcineae of Toboso (446)
Lathrop	*In Laudem Dulcineæ del Doboso (412)
Montgomery	IN PRAISE OF DULCINEA OF TOBOSO (333)

EXAMPLE 10: Don Quijote is no longer “el Caballero de la Triste Figura”; he is now “de los Leones.” (Part II, Chapter 30)

---

The text of the first edition makes no sense. The compositor was confused by an invented word used by Sancho (“figuro”). The Spanish, in Rico’s and most other modern editions, has Sancho say: “ya no hay triste figura ni figuro.” The Duke then continues: “Sea el de los leones...”

Ormsby — \*Emended: “there is no Rueful Countenance nor any such character now. ‘He of the Lions be it’” (3: 333)

Putnam — \*Emended: “There is no Knight of the Mournful Countenance any more, nor of any kind of Countenance. ‘Of the Lions let it be’” (708)

Cohen — Emended, but omits invented word: “there’s no *Sad Countenance* now. ‘Of the Lions, be it’” (666)

Starkie — Original: “for now there is no rueful figure.’ The duke continued: ‘Let the figure be a lion’” (743)

ODJ — Emended: “there is no Mournful Countenance nor any such character now. ‘He of the Lions be it’” (594)

Raffel — Emended: “there isn’t any Knight of the Sad Face any more — or sad figure, either. ‘Knight of the Lions it shall be’” (520)

Rutherford — Emended: “there isn’t any Sorry Face or sorry anything else any more. ‘Of the Lions be it...’” (691)

Grossman — \*Emended: “there’s no more Sorrowful Face, or Figure: let it be of the Lions” (657).

Lathrop — Original, but omits invented word: “there’s no more ‘Woebegone,’ just ‘He of the lions.’” (610)

Montgomery — Emended: “there is no longer a Woeful Countenance. ‘Lions’ it is.” (488)

## DEDICATIONS, LEGAL DOCUMENTS, PREFATORY POEMS

Both parts of *Don Quijote* appeared with dedications and, as was normal, supporting legal documents: Certificates of Price; Certificates of Errata; Royal Privileges (copyrights); Approbations (censor's approvals; those of Part I are missing). Part I is preceded and concluded by burlesque verse. The verse is surely by Cervantes, and is discussed by Rutherford "Translating *Don Quixote: The Poetry*". The dedication of Part II was also Cervantine, though not that of Part I.<sup>18</sup> Starting in the eighteenth century, scholars have suggested that the Approbation of Márquez Torres is by Cervantes.<sup>19</sup> The legal documents published in the original first editions help understand how Cervantes was viewed by his contemporaries, and the societal context in which he wrote.

---

18 See Rico, "El primer pliego."

19 See the summary of writing on this topic offered in the "Notas complementarias" of Rico's edition (2: 427 of the 2004 edition), and my *Interpretación cervantina*, n. 42 of Chapter 1 (21-22 of the printed book).



	PART I POEMS AT BEGIN- NING AND END	DEDICATIONS	LEGAL DOCUMENTS
Ormsby	Included	Included	Omitted
Putnam	Included	Included	Included
Cohen	Concluding verse only	Included	Omitted
Starkie	Included	Included	Only Appro- bation of Márquez Torres
ODJ	Included	Included	Included
Raffel	Concluding verse only	Part II only	Omitted
Rutherford	Included	Omitted* (xl)	Omitted
Grossman	Included	Part II only	Omitted
Lathrop	Included	Omitted	Omitted
Montgomery	Concluding poetry only	Included	Only Approbations of Val divielso and Márquez Torres

Where does this survey leave the reader who must use, or prefers to use, a translation? Once again, the complexity of the responses to Cervantes' work both astonishes and perplexes. Just as there is not (and cannot be) an edition of the work suitable for all purposes and readers, there is no one translation that will serve every purpose.

The following are some textual criteria that one might use in choosing a translation:

One might prefer the edition to follow a single edition of the Spanish text, and refer the reader to that edition for textual commentary; this is the approach followed by Grossman, Raffel, and Rutherford. However, each of them chooses a different edition. Rutherford, who is a Hispanist, has made the most up-to-date and enlightened choice (Murillo)<sup>20</sup>; in addition, Rutherford is the only translator who even mentions the edition of Rico, which I believe will be the standard edition of the Spanish text for our generation. Raffel is not a Hispanist, but he is familiar with Cervantine scholarship and has published in this journal. His choice of the revised Riquer is better than that of Grossman, a professional translator "intimidated by Cervantes scholarship," with "nightmares of armies of Hispanists coming after me," and who seemingly has ignored Cervantine scholarship altogether because, as she put it, "a lifetime would not be enough time to read it all, and I had a two years' contract." Her choice of Riquer was for "practical and sentimental" reasons.<sup>21</sup> Having decided to ignore Cervantine scholarship, it is unsurprising that her choice of text—the earlier, superseded Riquer—is one that no current Cervantes scholar would endorse, not even Riquer himself.

Putnam's approach is similar. He states that he primarily follows Schevill-Bonilla, but differs from the above three translators in occasionally departing from his source text, specifying in notes when this has taken place. Ormsby had a similar approach, but the edition in question was that of Hartzzenbusch.

To refer the reader to a Spanish edition for textual questions supposes, of course, that the reader can read it, in which case the need for a translation is questionable. For the reader who knows no Spanish,

---

<sup>20</sup> The edition of Murillo, who is of a generation subsequent to Riquer's, is more up to date than the small difference between it and the date of the revised Riquer would suggest.

<sup>21</sup> "Translating Cervantes," Hofstra University, November 4, 2004. Grossman was an invited speaker at the conference "*Don Quixote: The First 400 Years.*"

one might wish for some enlightenment about the difficulties of the text to be included. This is especially significant since an apparent deficiency of the text (the missing theft and recovery of the donkey) is discussed in the work itself.

Lathrop is the only translator who is himself an editor, and the only one to have published on the work's textual problems.<sup>22</sup> As one might expect, his translation provides, in notes, the most commentary on the text of the work. Nevertheless, Lathrop's extreme and idiosyncratic position on the works' errors—that Cervantes *wanted* the donkey to mysteriously disappear and reappear, for example, and wanted there to be no Chapter 43—to my knowledge has convinced no other Cervantes scholar. The information he provides about the text would presumably be labeled "misinformation."<sup>23</sup>

Another approach we might favor in a translation would be for the translator to approach the question of the text like an editor: to study the available materials, make decisions, and present the reader with the rationale used. This is indeed the approach taken by Ormsby and Putnam, whose translations stand head and shoulders above the others in the seriousness and detail with which textual questions are treated, and perhaps discouraged subsequent translators, such as Cohen, from treating the question at all. However, Ormsby and Putnam are the two oldest of the translations examined here. One could recommend either only if one were to dismiss the progress made in the last 50 years (Putnam) or the last century (Ormsby) in the study of the text: in realizing, for example, what the donkey problem reveals about revisions in Part I.<sup>24</sup>

As can be seen, the criteria used for selection of a translation are no simple matter. One might, in fact, choose such a basic criterion as including the entire work in the translation. Should not a translation of *Don Quixote*, the greatest work of secular literature, include the work in its entirety? Is this an unreasonable expectation? Yet three of the translations, including two recent ones, omit the burlesque preliminary

---

22 See the articles cited in note 13.

23 I have publicly and successfully debated with Lathrop the nature of the text's deficiencies, what he would call "alleged deficiencies." See Eisenberg and Lathrop.

24 Though it may seem strange, since progress is so slow that it seems at first non-existent, our understanding of the text has progressed significantly over the past hundred years. See Rico, "Historia del texto." On the implications of the donkey problem, see Stagg.

poems with which Cervantes began Part I. Others omit the dedications. None informs the reader that the Approbation of Márquez Torres— included by only four of the translators—is possibly a commentary by Cervantes himself on his book.

The treatment of the Spanish text to be translated is of course only one of several criteria to be considered in choice of a translation. Yet even from this limited perspective, it is impossible to make a clear recommendation. Just as no single edition of the Spanish text is adequate, no single translation is either. No serious student of the work in Spanish uses only one edition. The student of the work in English translation has even greater problems: the use of multiple translations should be just as routine. However strong our fantasy of “the perfect translation,” there will never be—indeed, *can* never be—a single English translation which meets every need.

42 Westchester Drive  
Clifton Park, New York  
daniel.eisenberg@projectcb.org  
daniel.eisenberg@bigfoot.com

## WORKS CITED

- Burch, Alan. Review of Miguel de Cervantes, *The History of That Ingenious Gentleman Don Quijote de la Mancha*, trans. Burton Raffel. *Cervantes* 17.1 (1997): 185–88. 30 July 2007 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/artics97/burch.htm>>.
- C., J. [Untitled column]. *Times Literary Supplement* 9 February 2007. 16.
- [Cohen, J. M.] Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *The Adventures of Don Quixote*. Translated by J[ohn] M[ichael] Cohen. 1950. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1970.
- Eisenberg, Daniel. *La interpretación cervantina del Quijote*. Trad. Isabel Verdaguer. Madrid: Compañía Literaria, 1995. 17 August 2007 <<http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/interpret/ICQindic.htm>> or [with different note numbers] <<http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?Ref=10758>>.
- . “No hay una primera parte del *Quijote*.” *El Quijote desde América*. Ed. Gustavo Illades and James Iffland. N.p.: Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla—El Colegio de México, 2006. 57–79. 30 July 2007 <[http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/cervantes/No\\_hay\\_una\\_1a\\_parte.pdf](http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/cervantes/No_hay_una_1a_parte.pdf)>.
- . “Rico, por Cervantes.” *Hispanic Review* 69 (2001): 84–88. 30 June 2007 <<http://>

- users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/reviews/rico.htm> or <http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/reviews/Rico.pdf>.
- . “El rucio de Sancho y la fecha de composición de la Segunda Parte de *Don Quijote*.” 1976. [Revised text.] *Estudios cervantinos*. Barcelona: Sirmio, 1991 [1992]. 143–52. 30 July 2007 <http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/cervantes/rucio.pdf>.
- Eisenberg, Daniel, and Tom Lathrop. “Debate Eisenberg-Lathrop: Los ‘errores’ en *Don Quijote*.” *Cervantismo en USA*. Ed. Francisco Layna Ranz and Georgina Dopico Black. Madrid: Polifemo, in press.
- . “The Eisenberg–Lathrop Debate.” Audio file. 18 August 2007 <http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/VideosAndSound/Eisenberg\_Lathrop\_Cervantes\_Deba.mp3>.
- . “The Eisenberg–Lathrop Debate.” *Cervantes*, in press. 18 August 2007 <http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/VideosAndSound/Eisenberg-Lathrop\_debate\_edited.pdf>.
- Friedman, Edward. “An Introduction to *Don Quixote*.” Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. *Don Quixote*. Trans. Walter Starkie. New York: New American Library, 2001. 19–35.
- . Personal communication. June 14, 2007.
- . Personal communication. June 15, 2007.
- [Gaos, Vicente]. Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de La Mancha*. Edición crítica y comentario de Vicente Gaos [completed by Agustín del Campo]. 3 vols. Madrid: Gredos, 1987.
- Grandbois, Peter. “Lost in the Details: Translating Master Peter’s Puppet Show.” Forthcoming in *Cervantes 27* (2007 [2008]). Available shortly at <http://www2.hnet.msu.edu/~cervantes/bcsalist.htm>.
- [Grossman, Edith.] Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quixote*. Trans. Edith Grossman. Introduction by Harold Bloom. New York: HarperCollins, 2003.
- . “Translating Cervantes.” Talk given at Hofstra University, November 4, 2004.
- Kirby, Carol. “The Preparation of a Genuine Critical Edition of Golden-Age Dramatic Texts: Theory, Methodology and Application.” *Editing the Comedia, II*. Ed. Michael D. McGaha and Frank P. Casa. Ann Arbor: Dept. of Romance Languages, University of Michigan, 1991. 1–38.
- Lathrop, Tom. “Un cajista examina varias ediciones del Quijote.” *Actas del XV Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*. Monterrey: Fondo de Cultura Económico, 2007. 281–87.
- [———]. Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. Tom Lathrop. 2 vols. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1997.
- [———]. [———]. *Don Quixote*. Fourth-Centenary Translation. Trans. Tom Lathrop. Illustrated by Jack Davis. Newark, DE: Cervantes & Co., 2005.
- [———]. [———]. *Don Quixote*. Fourth-Centenary Translation. Trans. Tom

- Lathrop. Illustrated by Jack Davis. "2nd printing" [actually revised 2nd edition]. Newark, DE: Cervantes & Co., 2007.
- . "Contradictions in the *Quijote* Explained." *Jewish Culture and the Hispanic World*. Ed. Mishael M. Caspi and Samuel Armistead. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 2000. 242–46.
- . "Contradictions or Typical Exaggerations? More on the Contradictions in *Don Quijote*." "Corónete tus hazañas": *Studies in Honor of John Jay Allen*. Ed. Michael J. McGrath. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 2005. 307–12.
- . "Edith Grossman's Translation of *Don Quijote*." *Cervantes* 26.1–2 (2006 [2007]), in press. Available shortly at <<http://www2.h-net.msu.edu/~cervantes/bcsalist.htm>>.
- . "In Laudem Dulcineæ del Doboso': More about Falsifications in *Don Quijote*." *BYU's Book of Papers from the Symposium*. Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 2006. 61–73.
- . "Introduction." Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. *Don Quijote*. Trans. Tom Lathrop. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 2005. vii–xxx.
- . "The Mysterious Missing Title of Chapter 43 of *Don Quijote*, Part I." *Cervantes y su mundo*, III. Ed. A. Robert Lauer and Kurt Reichenberger. Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 2006. 275–82.
- . "¿Por qué Cervantes no incluyó el robo del rucio?" *Anales Cervantinos* 22 (1984): 207–12.
- McGrath, Michael J. "Tilting at Windmills: *Don Quijote* in English." *Cervantes* 26 (2006 [2008]): 7–38. Available shortly at <<http://www2.h-net.msu.edu/~cervantes/bcsalist.htm>>.
- Montgomery, James H. "Was Thomas Shelton the Translator of the 'Second Part' (1620) of *Don Quijote*?" *Cervantes* 26 (2006 [2008]): 209–218
- [Montgomery, James H.] Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *The Adventures and Misadventures of Don Quijote. An Up-to-Date Translation for Today's Readers, Translated and Carefully Compared with the 15 Principal English Translations (from 1612 to 2003)* by James H. Montgomery. N.p.: Ne Plus Ultra Publications, 2006. [According to the title page verso, copies may be ordered at <[www.booksurge.com](http://www.booksurge.com)>.]
- . "Translating Cervantes." *Times Literary Supplement* 16 March 2007. 15.
- Ormsby, John. "Bibliography of *Don Quijote*." Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quijote of la Mancha*. Transl. John Ormsby. 4 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1885. 4: 410–26.
- [———]. Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quijote of la Mancha*. Transl. John Ormsby. 4 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1885. 12 July 2007 <<http://www.csd.tamu.edu/cervantes/english/ctxt/DonQ-JohnOrmsby/DonQ-JohnOrmsby.html>> or <<http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/996>> [without Ormsby's notes].
- . "Translator's Preface." Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. *The Ingenious Gentleman*

- Don Quixote of la Mancha*. Transl. John Ormsby. 4 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1885. 1: 1–77. 12 July 2007 <<http://www.csd.tamu.edu/cervantes/english/ctxt/DonQ-JohnOrmsby/DonQ-JohnOrmsby.html>> or <<http://gutenberg.com/eBooks/Adelaide/c/c41d/preface1.html>> [both incomplete and without notes].
- [Ormsby-Douglas-Jones.] Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quixote. The Ormsby Translation, Revised. Backgrounds and Sources. Criticism*. Ed. Joseph R. Jones and Kenneth Douglas. New York: W. W. Norton, 1981.
- Parr, James. "To the Editor." *Cervantes* 13.2 (1993): 135–37. 30 June 2007 <<http://www.hnet.org/~cervantes/csa/articf93/parr.htm>>.
- [Putnam, Samuel.] Cervantes, Miguel de. *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha*. A new translation from the Spanish text, with a Critical Text Based upon the First Editions of 1605 and 1615, and with Variant Readings, Variorum Notes, and an Introduction by Samuel Putnam. New York: Random House, n.d. [1949?].
- Raffel, Burton. "Translator's Introduction." Miguel de Cervantes. *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha*. New York: Random House, n.d. [1949?]. vii–xxv.
- . *The Art of Translating Prose*. University Park: Penn State UP, 1994.
- [———.] Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quixote. A New Translation. Backgrounds and Contexts. Criticism*. Trans. Burton Raffel. Ed. Diana de Armas Wilson. New York: W. W. Norton, 1999.
- [———.] Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *The History of that Ingenious Gentleman Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Trans. Burton Raffel. Intro. by Diana de Armas Wilson. 1995. New York: W. W. Norton, 1996.
- . "To the Editor." *Cervantes* 14.1 (1994): 107–09. 23 March 2007 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/artics94/raffel.htm>>.
- . "Translating Cervantes: *Una vez más*." *Cervantes* 13.1 (1993): 5–30. 30 June 2007 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/artics93/raffel.htm>>.
- Rak, Brian. Personal communication, December 11, 2007.
- [Rico, Francisco.] Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Edición del Instituto Cervantes, dirigida por Francisco Rico, con la colaboración de Joaquín Forradellas. Segunda edición revisada. 2 vols. + CD. Barcelona: Crítica, 1998.
- [———.]. [———.]. [———.]. Edición del Instituto Cervantes 1605–2005. Dirigida por Francisco Rico, con la colaboración de Joaquín Forradellas. 2 vols. + CD. Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg—Círculo de Lectores—Centro para la Edición de los Clásicos Españoles, 2004.
- . "Historia del texto." Miguel de Cervantes. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Edición del Instituto Cervantes, 1605–2005. Dirigida por Francisco Rico, con la colaboración de Joaquín Forradellas. 2 vols. + CD. Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg—Círculo de Lectores—Centro para la Edición de los Clásicos Españoles, 2004. 1: ccxxi–cclxxvi.

- . “El primer pliego del *Quijote*.” *Hispanic Review* 64 (1996): 313–36.
- . “*Quijotes* del siglo XX: El repudio de la crítica textual.” *Cervantes* 25.2 (2005 [2006]): 83–94. June 28, 2007 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/articfo5/ricof05.htm>>.
- [Riquer, Martín de.] Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Texto y notas de Martín de Riquer. 2 vols. 1944. Barcelona: Juventud, 1969.
- [———]. [———]. [———]. Texto y notas de Martín de Riquer. 3ª ed., con anotación ampliada y un índice onomástico y de situaciones. Paris: Librairie des Editions Espagnoles, 1955.
- [———]. [———]. [———]. Ed. Martín de Riquer. Barcelona: Planeta, 1980.
- [Rodríguez Marín, Francisco]. Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*. Nueva edición crítica, con el comentario refundido y mejorado y más de mil notas nuevas. 10 vols. Madrid: Atlas, 1947-1949.
- Ruiz Mantilla, Jesús. “Los hispanistas buscan restaurar la pureza cervantina del *Quijote*.” *El País* 21 July 2004: 33.
- Rutherford, John. “Brevisísima historia de las traducciones inglesas del *Quijote*.” *La huella cervantina en la cultura anglosajona*. Ed. J. M. Barrio Marco. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2007. 481-98.
- [———]. Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *The Ingenious Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Trans. John Rutherford, with an Introduction by Roberto González Echevarría. 2000 (without the Introduction). New York: Penguin, 2001.
- . “The Dangerous Don: Translating Cervantes’s Masterpiece.” *In Other Words: The Journal for Literary Translators* 17 (2001): 20-33.
- . “La domesticación de Don Quijote.” *Cartografías de la traducción*. Ed. Román Álvarez. Salamanca: Almar, 2001. 215-32.
- . “*Don Quijote* y la traducción de la risa.” *Boletín de la Biblioteca Menéndez y Pelayo* 131 (2005): 475-92.
- . Personal communication, January 5, 2008.
- . “Translating *Don Quixote*: The Poetry.” *Antes y después del Quijote*. Ed. Robert Archer et al. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana–Biblioteca Valenciana, 2005. 113-27.
- . “Translating Fun: *Don Quixote*.” *The Translator as Writer*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush. London: Continuum, 2006. 71-83.
- Stagg, Geoffrey. “Revision in *Don Quixote*, Part I.” *Hispanic Studies in Honour of I. González Llubera*. Oxford: Dolphin, 1959. 349–66.
- [Starkie, Walter.] Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quixote*. Trans. Walter Starkie. With a new Introduction by Edward H. Friedman. New York: New American Library, 2001.
- [———]. [———]. *Don Quixote of la Mancha. An abridged version designed to relate without digressions the principal adventures of the Knight and his Squire*. 1957. New York: New American Library, 1962.