



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

*Don Quixote* and Romanticism in Nineteenth-Century England: Irony in Duffield's, Ormsby's  
and Watts' Translations.

Fiona Evelyn Hamilton

Hispanic Studies  
The University of Edinburgh  
2016

Word Count: 99, 738

## **ABSTRACT**

The aim of this thesis is to offer a comparative analysis of the nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote* into English, which have received little critical attention to date. During this process I will focus on the issue of translating irony, in order to engage in the discussion regarding reader response to *Don Quixote* in England during the nineteenth century. This reader reception represents another area of research yet to be studied in any significant detail.

This thesis will take the following structure: in the first chapter I will provide a background into the existing problems and working concepts as they have been researched so far. In the course of this I will look at the work of Allen (2008) in particular, as the critic who has provided the longest known, though by no means exhaustive, list of examples of irony identified in *Don Quixote*. This will be followed by a review of reader response along the centuries, beginning with the seventeenth and eighteenth and then an overview of the nineteenth. I will then engage in an analysis of specific examples of irony, using a representative sample taken from Allen's selection. The conclusions this analysis will offer will shed further light on the importance of studying irony in *Don Quixote*, and also on how irony can be used as an explanation as to why so many translations of it were produced in such quick succession in the 1880s, after so long without any new versions. This research also considers the question of the transience of irony and the extent to which what constitutes irony changes over time, as reflected by a similar list of examples of irony compiled by Albert Calvert (1905).

My analysis will also add further evidence to the two main debates surrounding critical opinion on *Don Quixote* in the nineteenth century; firstly, that Ormsby's is justified in being regarded as the best translation of the three produced in that century, if not of all time, and secondly, the ongoing debate over whether or not *Don Quixote* was or should still have been regarded as a Romantic novel during the 1880s. By tracking trends and shifts in critical thinking down the centuries since *Don Quixote* first appeared at the start of the seventeenth century, my analysis will also offer some comment on the novel's subsequent twentieth-century reception. Moreover, as the first study of all three of the nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote* into English, my conclusions make an important and original contribution to the emerging area of study into Cervantes in a transnational context.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my utmost thanks and gratitude to my supervisor, Professor John A G Ardila, for his tireless support, commitment and encouragement.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**TITLE PAGE**

**ABSTRACT**

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**INTRODUCTION**

**CHAPTER 1: 'DON QUIXOTE', ROMANTICISM AND THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY TRANSLATIONS**

- 1.1 Romanticism in translations of *Don Quixote*
- 1.2 Methodological framework
- 1.3 Irony in translations of *Don Quixote*
- 1.4 Background to the nineteenth-century translations

**CHAPTER 2: THE RECEPTION OF 'DON QUIXOTE' IN ENGLAND**

- 2.1 Chronology of key shifts in the reception of *Don Quixote*
- 2.2 Formal literary criticism and the interpretation of *Don Quixote*
- 2.3 *Don Quixote's* reception in relation to its temporal context
- 2.4 Cervantes and the readers of *Don Quixote*
- 2.5 Towards a Romantic *Don Quixote*
- 2.6 Consolidation of literary criticism as a recognised phenomenon
- 2.7 The early stages of the rise of the Romantic *Don Quixote*
- 2.8 A mid-century dry spell in the Romantic reception of  
*Don Quixote* among English Readers
- 2.9 Defining a Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote*
- 2.10 Nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote*
- 2.11 The multi-faceted reception of *Don Quixote*

**CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF INSTANCES OF IRONY**

1. I, *Prólogo*: 43
2. I, *Prólogo*: 43
3. I, *Prólogo*: 45
4. I, 1: 61-62
5. I, 1: 62-63
6. I, 3: 74-75
7. I, 5: 88
8. I, 7: 104

9. I, 11: 126-127
10. I, 29: 316
11. I, 30: 322
12. I, 52: 521
13. II, *Prólogo*: 54
14. II, 11: 617-618
15. II, 12: 620
16. II, 22: 694
17. II, 38: 873
18. II, 71: 1026

### **CONCLUSIONS**

1. The importance of studying irony in *Don Quixote*
2. Irony as an explanation as to why several translations were produced in such quick succession at the end of the nineteenth century
3. Are existing critical assumptions regarding the success of the nineteenth-century translators' versions justified?
4. Irony's contribution to the debate over the existence of a Romantic *Don Quixote* during the nineteenth century
5. Irony's contribution to shaping a twenty-first-century view of *Don Quixote*

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

List of abbreviations used in this thesis:

<i>DRAE</i>	<i>Diccionario de la Real academia española</i>
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
<i>Tesoro</i>	<i>Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española</i>

Word Count:

Gross: 106, 791

Abstract: 426

Bibliography: 6, 627

Net Total as per DRPS Guidelines: 99, 738

## INTRODUCTION

*Don Quixote* remains one of the most widely read and intensively studied novels of all time, since the first publication of both complete parts in 1615. In 2002, it was voted the best literary book ever written in a poll conducted by the Swedish Academy, including authors such as Salman Rushdie, Seamus Heaney and Carlos Fuentes. *Don Quixote* won roughly fifty percent more votes than its nearest rival and has been described as the “one book you should read before you die” by the Nigerian author Ben Okri.<sup>1</sup> There has also been laudatory and extensive critical commentary in recent publications on the subject of the novel,<sup>2</sup> in particular on the issue of its reception in Britain. In fact, in an article in *The Guardian* Harold Bloom argues that the only author to have ever come close to matching the level of skill and success Cervantes displayed in his masterpiece, is Shakespeare.<sup>3</sup> One of the nineteenth-century translators of *Don Quixote* goes as far as to argue that the only book to enjoy a wider circulation and influence was the *Bible* (in Ardila 2009a: 23). When discussing the debate over whether or not it was correctly understood as being more than just a funny book among readers across the centuries, Close also notes that its huge popularity and widespread publication indicates that it must have been not only correctly understood but also respected (1978: 9). Even by the middle of the eighteenth century, *Don Quixote* was recognised in Spain as a “national masterpiece” (1978: 11) and Close goes on to argue that *Don Quixote* is in fact “a universal caricature of Enthusiasm and Sensibility” (1978: 12, my emphasis). Pardo extends this point further when he notes that, by the nineteenth century, Cervantes’ novel was widely read by children as well as adults; by readers of both English and Spanish, and these English-language readers were to be found in both the United Kingdom and the United States (2011: 367). Russell corroborates this argument further when he acknowledges that, even as early as the first half of the seventeenth century, *Don Quixote*’s influence was such that it had already superseded the literary sphere into the medical: a recommended cure for black bile in the 1620s was the reading of chivalric romances, but patients were warned by the medical profession at that time that an overdose would render them “as mad as *Don Quixote*” (Burton 1621: II, 92-93).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/may/08/humanities.books>

<sup>2</sup> Notable examples include Bell (2012) and Pavel (2013), among others.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2003/dec/13/classics.miguelcervantes>

Yet, despite such a high level of popularity and critical attention down the centuries, there remains one major area of Cervantine study almost entirely overlooked – the nineteenth-century translations of his masterpiece. Although Ormsby’s has received some commentary, this has only ever been in passing and Duffield’s and Watts’ are usually ignored altogether. In this thesis I will analyse each of these three translations in equal depth, specifically via their handling of irony. These were published in rapid succession, all within the same decade as each other: Duffield (1881), Ormsby (1885) and Watts (1888), and Pardo goes some way to providing an explanation for the sudden surge after such a long period without any translations being produced. He points to the fact that the nineteenth century witnessed a general sympathy emerging in literary thinking and, specifically, the latter decades of the century saw a marked increase in Cervantine activity in preparation for the celebration of the Tercentenary in 1905. Hilton’s research, half a century earlier, explored this theory in more detail and his view supports that put forward by Pardo. Essentially, the resurgence of critical and popular interest in *Don Quixote* in England at that time mirrored that which was happening in France, which in turn was triggered by a parallel trend in Spain. As the nineteenth century entered its final decades, Spain’s empire was in steady decline, disintegrating altogether at the culmination of the Spanish-American War in 1898. During the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, critical opinion of *Don Quixote* among traditional critics in Spain had largely taken the view that it represented “all that was uncivilised and disgusting” about the nation and its customs (Hilton 1947: 314). That, however, had been at a time when Spain’s foreign position was strong and any threats to their national identity seemed a distant impossibility. By the latter decades of the century the situation had changed dramatically, and Hilton points out that Spanish critics and authors began to “search desperately for the soul of Spain” (1947: 315). *Don Quixote* returned to the fore once more, resuming the position of esteem and popularity it had enjoyed during its early reception in Spain. Cervantes’ masterpiece underwent a similar realignment of its position among critics in France, as a result of which all of the great Italian and Spanish classics were resurrected and revered once more.<sup>4</sup> Although the British Empire’s decline had not progressed as far by the

---

<sup>4</sup> The French political shifts and their impacts on literary trends of the time are not centrally relevant to this thesis to warrant further analysis. For further reference, see Hilton (1947: 313-317).

end of the nineteenth century in comparison, there was more than enough of a parallel to trigger a similar revival of sympathetic interest in *Don Quixote* in England too.<sup>5</sup>

So, not only did events and circumstances in Spain lead to the resurgence in England of critical interest in *Don Quixote*, they also helped steer this critical thinking towards a more Romantic reception. Spain was nostalgic, desperately seeking to cling to its former national glory and pride and. As Victor Hugo had noted in his play *Hernani* in 1830, “joy’s smile is closer to tears than to laughter”, and this certainly seemed to be the case for how *Don Quixote* was received by readers in the second half of the nineteenth century.

If that explains the ‘why’ behind *Don Quixote*’s Romantic renaissance in England towards the end of the nineteenth century, the ‘how’ lies in broader social changes occurring across English society at the time. Although obviously not applicable to every corner of society, in the nineteenth century a lessening of the class divide has been noted, and the beginnings of a shift towards a more democratic and even society (Baugh and Cable 2002: 296).<sup>6</sup> As a result there were opportunities for more people than before to enjoying activities such as reading for leisure, and this increased stakeholder pool further contributed to the demand for formal literary criticism as the new mass of readers sought to understand the works now available to them.<sup>7</sup>

The culmination of this sudden flurry, which was triggered by the three translations, resulted in “una auténtica apoteosis cervantina” by the end of the century, although Pardo notes that to date “aún queda por hacer en este campo” (2011: 381-384). This thesis will attempt to reduce that knowledge gap. I will first contextualise my research by looking at what critical study has been carried out, including the seventeenth and eighteenth-century translations, as well as on the ongoing debate over whether *Don Quixote* is a funny book telling the story of a foolish protagonist, or in fact the heroic tale of a misunderstood hero. I will also explore the timing of the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* and how this fits into a nineteenth-century reception of Cervantes’ novel. I will do this by studying on both a formal and thematic level a representative selection of the one hundred and seven instances of irony identified – but not analysed – by Allen (1969; 2008).

---

<sup>5</sup> As Hilton notes, trends in the English reception at that point were “even more remarkable than in France” (1947: 316).

<sup>6</sup> Baugh and Cable cite events at Trafalgar, Crimea, the reorganisation of Parliament, the revision of the Penal Code and child labour restrictions as some of the contributing factors. Cf. Baugh and Cable 2002: 296-351.

<sup>7</sup> The rise of literary criticism is explored in more depth later in this thesis. See pp. 48-51.

Allen is regarded as one of the key recent thinkers in the field of study on Cervantes in England, and the statement made at a symposium organised to mark his retirement in 2000 that “very few people have had so great an impact on Cervantes studies during the past thirty years” (McGrath 2003: 11) illustrates just how high this critical regard is.

Allen’s is not the only study to have identified instances of irony in *Don Quixote*. A study using a similar methodology, compiled by Albert Calvert only two decades after the three nineteenth-century translations were published (1905: 89-97), identified 103 instances of irony which were all distinct from those identified by Allen. This indicates that, as someone much closer to the translations chronologically and, as a result culturally, what constituted irony for Calvert was no longer seen as ironic by Allen, and vice-versa. Whether or not the concept of irony can change over time is explored in more detail later in this study.<sup>8</sup> It is worth noting at this stage, however, that Allen’s study would not have offered anything new to the field of research if he had simply cited the same examples as his predecessor. This practical aspect may go some way towards explaining the lack of any overlaps between their lists, but the main causing factor is simply that the two men’s views of irony differed from each other’s. Allen appears to shy away from offering his own definition of irony as he saw it in the second half of the twentieth century. He presents numerous others’, including Russell, Close, Percas, Castro and Hatzfeld, followed by a brief evaluation of it not exceeding one sentence. As far as his own definition is concerned, however, Allen only goes as far as saying Close’s definitions are “the most perceptive and useful” of them all “and not, I think, at all incompatible with the conclusions of this study” (2008: 117). What Allen does provide, though, is an explanation of why there might be such a vast difference in perceptions of irony among readers from different generations: he lays out the basic, timeless approach for determining what is ironic as being no more than a decision to “set the text against one’s interpretation of it and then identify as ironic those passages which run counter to the interpretation” (2008: 117-118). Allen’s interpretation was influenced by the theories that came immediately before or around the same time as his. In other words, those critics that believed the Romantic reception had supplanted irony that was not intended to be there. Since Close has been well-documented as being one of the biggest advocates of that theory,<sup>9</sup> Allen earlier statement of alignment with his view

---

<sup>8</sup> See pages 24-26 in particular.

<sup>9</sup> Not least in his own numerous studies on the subject, especially in *The Romantic Approach to ‘Don Quixote’* (1978)

now becomes less vague and cagey in comparison to before. In contrast, the theories of irony in relation to *Don Quixote* that immediately preceded Calvert's work had come from the likes of Unamuno, Duffield, Ormsby and Byron. These critics were much more strongly inclined to see exactly the sort of irony as being present in Cervantes' novel that Close and Russell's camp were so against. By definition, such diametrically opposed definitions of any concept are only ever likely to produce two completely different lists of examples.

I have chosen to look at the differences between the three nineteenth-century translations' handling of irony as identified in Allen's list, rather than Calvert's, because the latter incorporates only irony contained within clearly defined "proverbs". This narrow focus of irony is also only one of many faults of Calvert's work, according to his contemporary critics. One reviewer at the time remarked that the only use his work served was for the pictures and diagrams, "but even here too much reliance must not be placed on the author's descriptions, which are mostly inadequate and amateurish, and sometimes wrong" (Oelsner 1906: 353). The following statement encapsulates why I have chosen not to use Calvert's study as the basis for my thesis:

The body of this book in no way advances our knowledge of Cervantes and his works: it is not distinguished by accuracy of detail, and from the standpoint of literary criticism its value is nil... The whole is as flagrant an example of bookmaking as it has been our lot to come across. (Oelsner 1906: 352-353)

Allen's list does contain some proverbs, but also instances of irony in its more subtle manifestations, hidden behind what is being said rather than visibly embedded within it. Whilst I do not seek to suggest that Calvert did not detect this more subtly interwoven irony, he openly states in the introductory paragraph that precedes his list that it was compiled in response to the comparative lack of collections of proverbs in English at the end of the nineteenth century, in comparison to the abundance in Spanish. He opens the chapter by stating that "it has been declared, without provoking contradiction, that Spanish proverbs are undoubtedly wiser and wittier, as well as more numerous than those of any other language" (1905: 89). He goes on to summarise that many such Spanish volumes were not only in existence, but also widely circulated, in Cervantes' day and that the author was highly likely to have been familiar with them when writing *Don Quixote*. Calvert explains to his reader that this is why he felt it necessary to present them with a selection, in order that they might understand Sancho's witticisms better (Ibid.) Unlike Calvert's list, not only was Allen's sample not restricted solely to proverbs, but it was also not confined to Sancho's speech either. Even within the eighteen samples included in my

study, in addition to two instances in which Sancho speaks, other characters include the dueña, a passing labourer at the roadside, Don Quixote himself, and also the author-narrator.

Aside from the significant presence of *Don Quixote* in popular culture, from the middle of the eighteenth century onwards in England there was a marked growth of scholarly interest in Cervantes. This had reached its peak by the second half of the nineteenth century, as is marked by the publication of the three translations which will be the focus of this thesis. Despite this surge in critical attention, however, the number of critical studies in the area of English translations of Cervantes' works remains relatively low: a number of studies on Spanish Golden Age writers were published much later in the 1970s and 1980s, when translation studies was first being recognised as an academic subject in its own right, such as Julio César Antoyo's work on *Lazarillo de Tormes* (1987), Isabel Verdaguer's doctoral thesis on *Guzmán de Alfarache* (1981) and Frances Luttkhuizen's on the *Novelas ejemplares* (1985). However, these focused mainly on the historical background of the source text's production and the author's biography and so provide only a factual insight into the authors' critical reception, not a critical analysis of the translation itself.

The existing knowledge gap in this field of research into Cervantes and *Don Quixote* that justifies this research is therefore threefold. Firstly, the lack of research conducted so far into the use and role of irony as a linguistic device in translations of *Don Quixote* into English. I would not argue that this void in critical attention is unique to translations of Don Quixote, but rather I would agree with De Wilde who has noted that "the translation of irony is rarely the explicit object of study in Translation Studies" in general (2010: 25). In fact, she cites only two other studies to date whose central focus has been on irony in translations, neither of which were of Don Quixote.<sup>10</sup> Although John Jay Allen's studies (1969, 1979 & 2008) are some of the few to explore the presence of irony in *Don Quixote*, they look only at the source text and not at how this irony fared in translation. Secondly, even less research has yet been carried out in the area of the nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote*, or even into the nineteenth-century reception of *Don Quixote* at all: whilst it is true that some laconic analysis of Ormsby's version does exist this is far

---

<sup>10</sup> She lists a doctoral thesis by Fehlauer-Lenz into Julio Cortázar's *Rayuela*, and an article by Chakhachiro on the translation of irony in general, not specific to any one text. Cf. De Wilde (2010: 25).

from exhaustive, and there has been even less written about Duffield and Watts' translations. Thirdly, there also subsequently remains a lack of focus on the possibility of a romanticised reception of the three nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote*. In each instance, it is the case either that no in-depth analysis has yet been carried out, or that an in-depth study has indeed been conducted but whose primary focus lay elsewhere and so only touched upon the three characteristics in question to a limited extent.<sup>11</sup> To explore this topic is of utmost importance in order to assess the reader response among English readers, and also to gain a fuller knowledge of the translations themselves; this is especially relevant given the large volume of research conducted into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in comparison. This thesis will, therefore, be the first to provide a comprehensive analysis of each of these three aspects currently lacking in the field of academic research into *Don Quixote* – the nineteenth century, the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* in the second half of the nineteenth century and how irony, as a key element involved in a Romantic reading of *Don Quixote*, was translated by the three nineteenth-century translators.

---

<sup>11</sup> I will discuss these studies later in this introductory chapter

## **CHAPTER 1: 'DON QUIXOTE', ROMANTICISM AND THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY TRANSLATIONS**

### 1.1 Romanticism in translations of *Don Quixote*

In comparison to their seventeenth and early eighteenth-century counterparts, nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote* have received very little critical attention. As a result, combined with the fact that no *Quixote* translations were produced in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, there has been very little study to date of the possible Romantic elements in translations of Cervantes' novel.<sup>12</sup> In Close's brief coverage of the period he focused on the German Romanticists, rather than their English counterparts. In his *Study of Don Quixote* (2007, second edition) Eisenberg devotes only one chapter to the Romantic period as a whole; Donahue indirectly deals with the issue when writing on Mary Shelley (2009), as does Gerli in his work on Sir Walter Scott (2005); likewise, Mancing and De Bruyn have both made only a brief reference to the topic in their respective chapters in *Ardila's Cervantean Heritage*. Although Ardila (2009b) has analysed two Quixotic plays from the nineteenth century – *A Romantic Drama* by George Almar and *A Comic Opera* by Harriet Stewart – these were produced in the 1830s and so the conclusions they draw offer little bearing on the elements of Romanticism which lingered and influenced approaches to literature in the second half of the nineteenth century.<sup>13</sup>

Before discussing the factors that led to the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* among its English readers, it is first of all necessary to identify what it is that constitutes the movement during the nineteenth century. Dictionaries from the period go some way towards clarifying this issue, though it is one that remains complex. Oswald's provides only a secondary nod to defining what Romanticism meant to critics and readers in the second half of the nineteenth century, under his entry for "legendary": it is described as a work of literature that is "fabulous, relating to a legend, romantic" (1859: 270) but does not include

---

<sup>12</sup> The only notable exception to this statement is the study by Close (1978).

<sup>13</sup> To list but a few examples, Morris has recently explored the late-Victorian fascination with the revival of legends, the blurring of previously respected boundaries between legend and history in literature, and the propensity for nostalgia in her study of *The Legend of King Arthur* (2011); McGavran explores the predominance of Romanticism as one of the driving forces in children's literature in the latter stages of the nineteenth century, promoting the view that children represented the "lamented the adult's loss of innocence, nobility, affinities with nature, and capacities for joy" (Soffer 1992: 544).

a definition of 'Romantic' in its own right. Likewise, Sullivan only skirts around the term and does not confront it head-on as far as defining an interpretation is concerned: "resembling the tales of *Romances*; and hence, wild, adventurous, fanciful, improbable. Romances were so called, because they were originally written in the Romance language, a mixture of (Roman) bad Latin and Frankish" (1838: 164). The *OED* further continues this trend of not yet having a known definition of what it actually meant for something to be Romantic, listing the definition from the seventeenth century which was merely "of the nature of or suggestive of romances or their imaginative or extravagant qualities" (1966: 772). More importantly, however, the entry then goes on to note that this particular portrayal was "renewed in the early nineteenth" century (ibid). The fact that none of the three sources produced in the middle of the that century offered an as yet established definition of what it meant for a work of literature to be Romantic indicates that the movement was still very much underway at that point. Although Victor Hugo was credited as being the first person to go some way towards coining the term 'Romanticism', his definition of "liberalism in Literature" (1830: 922), is criticised by modern critics who argue that it does not encompass the full scope of the Movement and its identity.<sup>14</sup>

On that basis, there was as yet no universally accepted or circulated definition of Romanticism by the second half of the nineteenth century. What is also significant is that nor were there any further notable publications of critical dictionaries in the English language in England during the remainder of the century, which strongly points to there being no major changes in meaning or interpretation of the terms in question since the ones discussed above.

In addition to considering nineteenth-century dictionaries, recent studies in the field of English Language have shed new light on what Romanticism looked like to critics at the time. The four main features can be summarised as emotions, curiosity to know and understand beyond the text itself, pain and freedom. Romantic literature and poetry was

---

<sup>14</sup> Paul Roy, for example, argues that it is "vague and one-sided", and embodies only the spirit of the French Revolution (2014:49). Hugo's definition also mentions only the art of the "freeing of the artist and writer from restraints and rules" but does not offer anything less broad and wide-ranging than this (cf. Harmon and Holman (1992)). Although the critical consensus today is that it remains impossible to give a definitive definition of the term 'Romanticism', the vagueness of Hugo's is particularly evident when compared alongside more recent definitions, which did benefit from the surety of hindsight. One prime example of this is Sedwick's list of characteristics and features of Romanticism that spans more than a page in his article on defining literary movements (1954: 468-469).

that which provided a vehicle for the author to outpour their emotions and feelings externally; it allowed them room to create and be inspired. The finished outcome was not in fact the most important element of the work's creation, instead it was the act of writing that was key. Shelley's *Defense of Poetry*, published posthumously in 1840, is one example of this in which he states that "when composition begins, inspiration is already on the decline" (Ingwen and Peck 1965: 135). The Romantic element is therefore the creative and inspirational journey, driven by the author's own internal emotions, which led them to the point of writing. Similarly, Baudelaire stated in 1846 that "Romanticism lies precisely in neither the choice of subject nor the depiction of truth, but in the manner of feeling" (Le Dantec 1964: 879) which echoes Wordsworth's earlier proposition in his *Lyrical Ballads*, published in 1798, that "all good poetry is the spontaneous overflow of feelings" (Brett and Jones 1996: 246). Unlike preceding works of literature, Romantic novels and poetry were less bound by norms and rules, and offered more scope for versatility on the part of the author.<sup>15</sup>

Romanticism was emotionally founded and driven, according to primary users. It was also a desire to go beyond reading the text itself and discover what lay behind it, as well as what had driven the author's emotional journey to creating that particular work. It was a need to empathise with the author, and to know more about them in order to be able to do this. The lengthy paratexts which accompany the three translations produced in the 1880s are perfect illustrations of this, each going into detail about Cervantes' time as captive in Lepanto, the underhand tactics by Lope and Avellaneda to damage his career, and the cruelty of Court politics that led to Cervantes' financial difficulties. Other studies, such as Duffield's *Recollections of Travels Abroad* (1889) and biographies of Cervantes by the likes of Fitzmaurice-Kelly (1892, 1905 and 1913) illustrate the strength of the popular need among Romantic critics and readers to go beyond the text and get to know its author.<sup>16</sup> Andrew Piper goes some way to explaining this surge beyond the previously defined barriers surrounding a work of literature: he recently noted that "Romanticism is what happens when there is suddenly a great deal of books to be read, indeed when there are too many books" (2009: 12). The surge in literary publications that occurred in England

---

<sup>15</sup> This in turn goes some way to explain the suggestion that Romantic receivers of *Don Quixote* affixed irony to the text that may not have been intended by the original author.

<sup>16</sup> See also Eric Eisner's *Nineteenth-Century Poetry and Literary Celebrity* (2009) for further exploration of the newfound fashion for knowing the author behind the work as well as the text itself.

during the second half of the nineteenth century<sup>17</sup> meant that there was an overabundance of books for readers to immerse themselves in, and therefore soon the text on its own stopped being enough.

Aside from providing a vehicle for the outpouring of the author's emotions and creativity, and the need to know as much as possible about the wider circumstances surrounding what led the author to create the work of literature, Romanticism to critics in the second half of the nineteenth century was also driven by a fascination with human physiology and anatomy. In some cases, this was in the form of the human body as a vehicle to revive old nostalgic legends, and relive their heroic tales of bygone eras. Megan Morris (2011) explores this in relation to King Arthur and the resurgence in critical interest in his legend during the second half of the nineteenth century. Another aspect of the nineteenth-century Romantic fascination with the human body was around the concept of pain and suffering. In his *Travels*, for example, Goethe had devoted the entire third chapter to the time his protagonist spent visiting medical theatres and attending lectures on surgical topics, skills which he would later put into practice to save his own child. Other subsequent works, such as Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818), also illustrate how the more general growing fascination with surgery and anatomy endured during the decades after Goethe's work was originally written in 1786-88. Similarly, Piper also notes that the issues of pain and suffering had long been present in Romantic thinking since the turn of the nineteenth century (2009: 45-47), and reading the hugely sympathetic and heroic-sounding accounts of Cervantes' time in captivity and incarceration, and the hardships he endured during those times, this feature of Romanticism is also clearly interlinked with the reader's desire to know more about their author.

The fourth feature of what Romanticism looked like to readers and critics in the second half of the nineteenth century, according to primary sources, is the concept of freedom from the constraints of previously established rules and norms when creating their works of literature. In Goethe's *Faust* (1808 and 1832), his protagonist flees his study to go and work elsewhere due to the physical constraints that he feels are imposed upon his creativity by the book-lined walls. Likewise, in *The Serapion Brothers* (1819-21), for example, Ernest Hoffmann's title character is named the patron saint of Romanticism due to his "fidelity to an inner vision, however discordant with an external reality" (Piper 2009:

---

<sup>17</sup> See Piper's introductory chapter for a detailed exploration and analysis of this.

69). Peter von Matt not only summarises the relationship between the Romantic need for literary freedom during the nineteenth century in general, but also the way this fourth feature is linked to the first discussed, when he offers the following description of Serapion:

Precisely because of his variety of insanity, Serapion becomes the Un-image of the poet, the goal towards which every narrative artist should strive: to fashion everything in and out of his inner self. (Piper 2009: 69)

In essence, the Romantic author cannot outpour their innermost feelings and emotions if they do not have the freedom to do so.

As well as considering what Romanticism looked like to critics and readers in England during the nineteenth century, what is also central to this study is then to define the movement in the specific context of Cervantes' masterpiece. According to Schmidt, the origins of the term 'Romanticism' in the context of literature are three-fold: the chivalric romances as a genre, literature originating from Romance languages and literature which conforms to the genre of the novel as the embodiment of modernity (2011: 52). Definitions of Romanticism in relation to its approach to *Don Quixote*, however, are much less specific. De Bruyn gives one such example and argues that the Romantic approach is merely one which emphasises the conceptual over the vividly concrete, which promotes elaborate descriptions through both poetic detail and language and has a tendency to seek deep symbolic meanings in seemingly trivial details (2009: 46). He cites Morrison's play produced in 1895 as an example. Mayo and Ardila identify the need for a hero in any Romantic work of literature which will always fit the description of "a sad and idealistic novel" (2009: 56), and this emphasis on the sad and idealistic links directly with the common critically identified trait of nostalgia. Romantics advocated a perspective based on emotion, passion and a pining for the bygone past (Close 1973: 238). Moreover, this tendency towards emotion-led subjectivity is what in turn leads to the propensity to identify and sympathise with a protagonist (Donahue 2009: 181-186; Close 1978: 12), which then enables the reader to identify a hero in a novel regardless of the character's actual nature or actions (Schmidt 2011: 51). One important question which this study will seek to answer is therefore whether or not Romanticism in receptions of literature in Britain remained alive throughout the nineteenth century, or whether it simply influenced later receptions through the legacy it had left behind.

Those studies that do exist in relation to nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote* have chosen to focus predominantly on Ormsby's. The *Gran Enciclopedia*

*Cervantina* includes an entry on Ormsby (Alvar 2010: 6299-6303) but leaves out both Duffield and Watts.<sup>18</sup> Despite this disparity in critical focus between translators, the topic of the novel's interpretation in England was developed timidly towards the 20<sup>th</sup> century, via studies by the likes of James Fitzmaurice-Kelly (1892; 1898). By the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century this critical interest had gained momentum, with contributions from Burton (1968), Staves (1972), Megías and Ardila (2009e), Ardila (2009f), Colahan (2009), Hayes (2009) and McGrath (2009) among others.<sup>19</sup>

The obvious conclusion to draw from the sheer volume of critical attention paid to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is that it highlights the scarcity of research carried out into the novel's reception among nineteenth-century English readers. The few studies that have been carried out were only done recently, and so it remains a newly-tapped topic of research in spite of all those studies that came before it. My research will go beyond these initial suggestions put forward in the existing research into *Don Quixote's* reception among English readers, by diversifying and adding to the field an awareness of the role played by Romanticism in that reception of the 1880s translations.

Another major area of existing research on the topic of the reception of *Don Quixote* during the nineteenth century which requires further exploration relates to that century on a more individual level, distinct from the seventeenth and eighteenth. It was not until the nineteenth century that analysis of Cervantes' novel was being carried out by those with a critical background based primarily in Hispanic Studies, as opposed to other areas (Close 1978: 248). There is, however, only limited truth in Close's statement, given that neither Duffield nor Watts came from the field of Hispanic or even literary studies in general. Despite this, the fact that these were the only three translations produced throughout the entire century means it is vital to examine each in its own individual right, rather than analysing the nineteenth-century English reception through the broader viewpoint of a literary movement. In so doing, not only will I be able to compare and contrast how each of the translators tackled the translation process of one of the most complex novels ever written, I will also provide a more rounded and balanced view of critical attitudes towards *Don Quixote* at the time.

---

<sup>18</sup> See also Ardila 2009a: 23; 46-49; 57; & 68-72.

<sup>19</sup> Please see the Bibliography for additional critical studies published in the second half of the twentieth century.

The multi-author volume edited by Ardila (2009a), as well as works by Barrio Marco (2007) and Fernández Morera and Hanke (2005), include numerous chapters which touch upon the reception of *Don Quixote* in England during the nineteenth century. Yet, where the focus of the analysis of this reception is centred on the novel's translations, it is only ever Ormsby's that receives any significant attention while Duffield's and Watts' receive only a passing remark. In the entry on Ormsby in the *Gran enciclopedia cervantina* Ardila acknowledges that Ormsby's quickly consolidated its position as one of the best English translations ever produced (in Garrido Gallardo 2010: 6300). De Bruyn notes that nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote* exist, but only goes as far as acknowledging them as "credible translations", and subsequently devotes less than half a paragraph to summarising their contribution to understanding the reception of *Don Quixote* in nineteenth-century England (2009a: 49). In fact, the lengthiest and most detailed analysis of Ormsby's peers' translations is found in McGrath's chapter on 'The Modern Translations of *Don Quixote* in Britain' (2009a: 76-77), but even then his commentary on Duffield's comprises of a mere two pages. In his *A Study of Don Quixote*, Eisenberg makes no mention whatsoever of Duffield's or Watts' translation but does refer to Ormsby's contributions in both the Introduction as well as the following chapter (1987: xx; 5). As well as a current need for an in-depth study into the nineteenth-century reception of *Don Quixote* in England, and into the role played by irony in this reception, there is also a need to examine the work of each of these three translators on a more equal and even basis than has been done to date.

In order to adequately analyse the reception of *Don Quixote* among English readers during the nineteenth century, I will first look at the reader response along the centuries before and after this period. The way critics and readers of *Don Quixote* viewed the book and its protagonist during the seventeenth century influenced how subsequent generations of readers during the eighteenth century received it. In turn, the eighteenth-century legacy also contributed to the way that nineteenth-century English readers interpreted Cervantes' masterpiece. The following chapters prior to analysing the nineteenth-century translations themselves will therefore focus on the reception of *Don Quixote* in England across the centuries following its publication.

During the early seventeenth century, *Don Quixote's* character was generally regarded as being little more than a fool, and the novel was received by its English readership as a source of entertainment. That it served exclusively as a source of

entertainment and nothing more became less readily accepted as the seventeenth century progressed, and it began to emerge that, although the comic function of *Don Quixote* was undeniable, this was not necessarily its sole function.

The arrival of the eighteenth century marked the birth of the age of satire. It saw a significant number of alternative Quixote figures, giving rise to protagonists who had been hitherto misunderstood and underrepresented, and yet no less ridiculous, than Cervantes' own Quixote. Examples include the female Quixote, the spiritual Quixote and the ideological or political Quixote, though these are not exhaustive categories.<sup>20</sup> By personifying outdated and ridiculous parodies, these Quixote figures were able to emerge to the critical fore and offer a wider and more serious social critique than before. Moreover, the Quixote figure by this point carried a more meaningful connotation and purpose. At some stage during the eighteenth century's progression into the nineteenth, the English reception of *Don Quixote* took yet another step further away from the view that it was purely, or even primarily, a source of comic entertainment. The attitude of readers at this time shifted towards the direction of the hero and the sublime. Therefore, in order to understand how and why nineteenth-century readers of *Don Quixote* in England arrived at their perceptions of the novel and its knight, it is necessary to look at what led them there.

## 1.2 Methodological framework

Halverson notes that when clarifying the methodology for any textual analysis, "it is fundamental for any comparative procedure to reflect on and, if possible, to agree on (1) the terms between which the comparison will be realised, i.e. the unit of comparison, (2) the nature and degree of the differences and similarities that will be identified and (3) the criteria according to which the comparison will be carried out." (1997: 209-10). The former will be a comparative analysis of the way in which *Don Quixote's* only three nineteenth-century translators, Duffield, Ormsby and Watts, have dealt with a number of instances of

---

<sup>20</sup>Ardila notes that the term 'quixotic' has come to encompass "anything related to *Don Quixote* the novel and *Don Quixote* the character, and the term *quixotic fiction* has been associated with the second and third-rate novels whose titles bear the name *Quixote* and which narrate the adventures of characters who resemble the Spanish knight" (2009a: 11). A 'Quixote figure' refers specifically to a character who serves as a "a straightforward and popular means to pass judgement on English society" (2009a: 13), usually by means of their gender, political or religious beliefs. For a further discussion of the terms "quixotic" and "quixotism", see the Volume II of the *Cervantes Encyclopedia* (2003: 598-599)

Cervantes' "sustained" (De Bruyn 2009:38) "playful and capricious irony" (Close 2000: 12), in order to analyse and showcase the reception of Cervantes' iconic novel in England during the nineteenth century. The units of comparison are taken from the recent revised re-edition of John J. Allen's *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool?* (1969), entitled *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool? Remixed* (2008). Using a selection from Allen's list, the nature and degree of differences and similarities between the original source text author's irony, and whether or not Duffield, Ormsby and Watts retained this in their nineteenth-century translations, will be the focus. The criteria according to which the comparison will be carried out will be "irony-intensifying or irony-reducing" shifts (Coromines I Calders 2009: 83). In other words, whether or not the translators discarded, retained or embellished the original irony. I will then seek to understand the reasons for these translation shifts, in the context of what is already known about the reception of *Don Quixote* in England during the nineteenth century.

Recent critics agree that analysing the translation of irony is a complex task without a clear direction from which to approach it. One critic has even suggested this is the very factor that has deterred many scholars from conducting research into it so far – De Wilde states that "the lack of consensus regarding the definition and conceptual scope of literary irony" and "the fact that investigating irony within a product-orientated methodology entails a number of thorny questions regarding the procedures of comparative microtextual analysis" have put critics off (2010: 25). The first of these two statements is easily confoundable, due to the vast array of varying definitions of irony put forward by critics over the years.<sup>21</sup> The second, however, is more subjective and one which I would refute. De Wilde goes on to argue that "even if research on the clausal or phrasal level has provided very useful analytical toolkits, it does not suffice for the comprehension of more sophisticated forms of irony that are displayed through contradictions or incongruities on an above-phrase level" (Ibid). However, whilst this may be true in the case of other source text authors and their works, Cervantes' brand of irony is so unlike anyone else's in its complexity and intricacy, that it is precisely through dissecting passages of *Don Quixote* and phrasal level that the bigger picture is set free.

De Wilde's view of microtextual analysis not serving as a valid means of drawing conclusions on a macrotextual level is not shared by other recent critics. Coromines i

---

<sup>21</sup> The issue of definitions of irony will be explored later in this introductory chapter.

Calders, for example, points out that “descriptive and comparative analysis at microstructural level may generate important information about a hypothetical macrostructural impact on the translated text” (2010: 64), and a prime example from *Don Quixote* to support this would be the satire woven into the reference to the curate being a graduate of Sigüenza.

When choosing which of Allen’s instances to include in my analysis, the first challenge was the need to strike an acceptable balance between breadth and depth. Within the bounds of the scope of this thesis, the number of sentences I have chosen provides more than enough material to use as a basis for analysis, whilst simultaneously incorporating enough examples of the different manifestations of Cervantes’ irony to serve as a representative sample. I sought to take a sample which spread across both the first and second Parts, and their respective prologues, in order to facilitate an analysis which spanned the entirety of *Don Quixote*. This enabled me to detect any shifts or evolutions in the irony over the course of the text. I had originally selected twenty, which were then streamlined to eighteen. The selection process itself was based on a straightforward principle; essentially, which phrases were the most ‘ironic’, or rather, which of the ones on Allen’s list conformed most closely to the concept of an intentional variance on the part of the source text author between what is said and what is meant. Admittedly, a concept as complex and intricate as irony is present to some extent in most statements or passages, but I have sought to isolate those in which the concentration of the irony is the greatest. One key indicator of where this is the case is the use of repetition of a specific example of irony, which is why I have retained those instances which denote a recurrent theme, such as the confusion of the monetary and the moral, or false erudition on the part of the narrator. As Coromines i Calders has noted, by sticking to those instances where the irony was most present such an approach “allows the researcher to avoid the manifold semantic shades of ironic expressions by filtering them through one single criterion” (2009: 64). Further support for my methodology lies in the fact that other studies have analysed even fewer instances than I have in this thesis: in her own analysis of irony in *Im Krebsgang*, Coromines i Calders includes only ten instances, and in Linder’s analysis of irony in *The Maltese Falcon* he focuses solely on one.

The cost of including additional passages to the eighteen I have used would have been to the detriment of the depth of analysis I could have provide elsewhere. In order to be able to evidence and support these conclusions, at least some of these footnotes

needed to be included even if this was at the expense of two further instances of irony. Most importantly, I did not detect any further insight into Cervantes' irony provided in those instances removed from this study that I had not already found elsewhere. On balance, what was gained by excluding these from my analysis heavily offset any contribution to the overall outcomes that the two omitted instances could have made.

An additional factor which dominated the selection process was the distribution of the phrases throughout Cervantes' novel. Given how little has been studied in relation to irony in *Don Quixote*, it is likely that readers of this thesis will be unfamiliar with Cervantes' irony or how this is linked to key features of his story, such as the protagonist's character evolution from madness to sanity. On that basis, I decided to include more instances of irony from earlier on in *Don Quixote* than from later chapters; this enables my reader to gather a firm grounding in the key features of irony in Cervantes' novel, therefore facilitating a more grounded and informed basis for comparison with later passages. In fact, instances from Part II and its prologue were often chosen specifically to be compared with earlier counterparts. My selection was based on one of the earliest known theories of irony, coined in Spain shortly before *Don Quixote* was published, and therefore one which would have been known to Cervantes: Cipriano Suárez' threefold concept of irony, first presented in his *De Arte Rhetorica* (1568). His theory is based on the premise that irony can be executed either via the words spoken by an individual, via the individual who speaks them, or via the context or circumstances in which they are said.<sup>22</sup> Taking the second of these potential criteria as an example, in the first instance analysed the reader immediately recognises that in the Prologue to Part I the author-narrator of course does not think for a second that his book is worthy of little regard, or he would not have gone to the trouble of having it published in the first place. The irony therefore exists in the sarcasm and false self-deprecation belying his words. In contrast, in the counterpart prologue to Part II (the thirteenth quote analysed), when the author-narrator is again presenting the proceeding story to the reader he is fiercely defiant and openly defensive of his work and this provides clear ground for direct comparison.

Suárez' third form of ironic execution, referring to the context or circumstances surrounding a verbal statement, also plays a significant role in answering one of the central questions in this study: which of the three nineteenth-century translations was closest to

---

<sup>22</sup> For further exploration of Suárez' definition of irony, see the translation and accompanying notes by Flynn (1956).

the ironic tone of the source text. Though the scope of this study constrains it to comment only in relation to how each of the three translated irony, it is often the circumstances surrounding an individual's words which shed most light on this. One such example is in the fifth instance analysed, in which the success of irony in the hinges entirely on whether or not the translator understood the significance of the University of Sigüenza, as opposed to any Spanish universities at that time. This is also the case in the seventeenth passage analysed, where the success of Cervantes' criticism of the confusion between money and morals, aimed at the Duke, relies on the translator having already been aware of Don Quixote's ongoing transition towards sanity. On previous occasions, like the incident with the farmhand Andrés or the galley slaves, Don Quixote forced his assistance onto his perceived victim without them asking for or wanting it. By the latter stages of Part II when this instance occurs he is now seen as a genuine source of help and wisdom to whom those in need can turn. If any of the translators had failed to track the protagonist's transition from fool to hero, then the irony in this instance would have been lost on them altogether.

As mentioned above, there has been little recent research into Cervantes as an ironist as the primary Focus. Whilst resources such as Allen's later re-edition in 2009 are rare, and therefore extremely useful and valuable, at the same time their focus is always on a translation of the original and not the source text itself.<sup>23</sup> The result is that he offers the reader an insight into the finished translation product, rather than the actual source text, which obviously creates a risk that the instances of irony Allen presents may be far removed from Cervantes' own. Moreover, beyond the assertion that irony turns the perception of the knight from a fool to a hero, Allen's study only lists and does not analyse or evaluate the author's use of irony. It does not offer any critical acknowledgement of the importance of the role of irony in determining whether Don Quixote was seen as a hero or fool among each version's contemporary audiences, and it also subsequently overlooks the role played by irony in facilitating the Romantic approach to Cervantes' novel.

The structural form that this research will take consists of three chapters: in the first of these I outline the aims, objectives and projected conclusions to be drawn as a result of carrying out my research; this is followed by an explanation of my methodology

---

<sup>23</sup> Allen uses Samuel Putnam's translation, though he advises his reader that at times he deviates from this "at times for accuracy, at other times for precision" (2008: 17). Putnam's translation has received positive critical attention, though it has been noted that his retention of archaic language at times in Spanish jars against the highly modernised English he uses (Stavans 2008) and Hart states that Putnam's should be considered below Smollett's translation (1986: 122).

and the justifications for my research, in which I will explore in more detail the existing knowledge gap in the relevant fields of literature and study. The final three sections of this first chapter will provide an overview of the reception and interpretation of Cervantes' novel in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the case of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, although my research will focus primarily on the reception in England of what Fielding termed "the canon of the novel" (quoted in Ardila 2009a: 124), where necessary I will also analyse the spread of Cervantes' and *Don Quixote's* influence and reception in other countries across Europe, for example, the spread of German Romanticism throughout Europe and into England. I have chosen to focus on the nineteenth century on its own because this will enable me to look in maximum depth at the dominant trends and tendencies in critical theories regarding *Don Quixote* and its reception in the context of the predominant philosophical and ideological movements at that time. The discussion of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries will inform and contextualise the subsequent discussion of the nineteenth-century reception, but the wealth of existing studies in this area removes the need for any further analysis here.

Nevertheless, when looking at seventeenth-century literary trends and criticism in relation to the reception and interpretation of *Don Quixote*, I will take into account concepts such as *humanism* which dominated scholarly thinking during this period.<sup>24</sup> In the case of the eighteenth century an equivalent concept to consider will be the Neoclassical movement (Yamada 2005: 3-23), triggered at least in part by the French Revolution and subsequent ensuing social changes. When analysing the spread of Romanticism during the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, and how this affected the reception and interpretation of *Don Quixote*, I will analyse trends in critical thinking in the context of industrialisation, as well as movements such as Existentialism (Colahan 2009: 62; Mancing 2009: 111) and the resurgence of literary Humanism.

---

<sup>24</sup> De Bruyn (2009: 33-34); Darby and Samson (2009: 227); and De Mann (1996: 1-2) have already explored the relationship between humanism and the reception of *Don Quixote* in seventeenth-century England.

### 1.3 Irony in the translations of *Don Quixote*

Cervantes' use of irony in *Don Quixote* is the main linguistic aspect of the narrative I will use as a basis for comparing the source text with the three translations. I have chosen to restrict my study to this one aspect over any of the other salient features of *Don Quixote's* narrative, such as humour or deception, because understanding the author's and translators' handling of this "hopelessly complex" phenomenon (Allen 2008: 115) is key to understanding the protagonist's himself. It is also central to recognising and explaining any shifts in message or intended purpose within the novel between Part I and Part II, such as Don Quixote's character evolution and also his relationship with the world around him. Irony was a key feature in the majority of Cervantes' works, and was a hugely prominent literary phenomenon in his day.<sup>25</sup> Russell notes that this is in spite of the fact that he was the first author to use irony in the way he did; in fact, he states that "from Marxists to New Humanists and at all points in between, there is a noticeable avoidance of the theoretical problems presented by comic literature" (1969: 314), albeit that irony and humour are not always directly linked. However, how Cervantes handled irony was entirely innovative and laid the foundations for subsequent writers in generations to come, and this explains why Allen went to such lengths to catalogue examples of it. Defining the full scope of what makes it so unparalleled in its nature and success, or the difficulties around trying to capture a comprehensive definition of such an untameable concept, has been the subject of much critical focus in recent years. Rubin Quintero, for example, highlights the unprecedented scale on which Cervantes employed irony, which was facilitated further by the fact that he used "dialogue as a constitutive part of the action, and used as an exploration of truth (2008: 90). By including more speech, Cervantes provided himself with more opportunities to interweave more satirical or parodic statements. Furthermore, increased speech helps enable the reader to get to know the characters more quickly, and so they soon begin to recognise the subtleties surrounding each character's normal behaviours. As a result, they are soon able to detect either when a particular character says

---

<sup>25</sup> A notable example is the poetry written by Quevedo, one of the key figures of the *concepcionista* movement, who utilised puns in his poetry in order to mock others. The picaresque novels which rose to the fore in Spain during the 16th century before enjoying a similar heyday in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, relied heavily on the use of irony in the form of satire. Notable examples include *Lazarillo de Tormes* (1554) and *Moll Flanders* (1722), among others. See Ardila (2010) for an in-depth study of picaresque novels and their use of satire.

something out of character, or in a manner that is out of character, and immediately understand why. As well as speech critics have also noted the far-reaching and all-inclusive list of targets of Cervantes' irony, namely, that nothing is free from his ironic scrutiny. As Antonio García Berrio points out, Cervantes irony extends to a "destabilisation of any moral example and every similitude and fictional licence" (1992: 303). In doing so, Cervantes creates an "ironic counterpoint in which everything is taken to the limits of a given convention – because nothing is sustained when it has been surpassed" (Ibid). In other words, not only does he ironically scrutinise every available piece of subject matter, he also does so at every available opportunity.

As well as being vast and relentless, Cervantes' irony also stands out from anything seen before due to its two-step nature. The first aspect of this is in regards to his co-existent use of two different forms of satire; firstly, the direct and personal lampoon attack, and secondly, the reproof of vice with a moralising objective. Although it is accepted that Cervantes' views of parody were aligned with those of his contemporaries,<sup>26</sup> critics agree that to employ them simultaneously in a work of literature had not been seen before.<sup>27</sup> The second two-step element of Cervantes' irony which sets it apart from anything seen before is the way he simultaneously attacks and defends the victim of his irony. Edward Riley has studied this in detail in *La teoría de la novela en Cervantes* (1962), as has Allen (2008) and Quintero (2008). Thirdly, Eric Clifford Graf has highlighted the way Cervantes first presents his irony and then validates it in such a way that the reader feels they cannot chastise him for it, a "second rhetorical move whereby it acquires sincerity" (2007: 136). This unique feature of Cervantes' irony has also been the subject of a study by Javier Herrero, focusing specifically on the Sierra Morena episodes (1977: 141-149).

Within the specific context of *Don Quixote* Cervantes' unique use of irony is particularly significant, because the 1880s and 1890s have been recognised as a period of "renacimiento del interés por Cervantes", indicated by the sudden production of three translations after more than a century (Pardo 2011: 381). This, against the backdrop of a century which observed "una especie de floración cervantina finisecular" (Ibid.), suggests that these two decades were more reproductive than productive. Whilst giving a new lease

---

<sup>26</sup> Lopez Pinciano, Francisco Cascales and Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa, for example. Cf. Quintero (2008: 90) for more information.

<sup>27</sup> Quintero discusses this co-existence in detail, using *Don Quixote's* advice to the hidalgo father of a young poet in Part I Chapter 16 and then the attack on Avellaneda through Altisadora's account of the tennis match between two devils in hell in Part II Chapter 70 as examples (2008: 90-91).

of life to something which was entirely new in its day, this element of reproduction is also a direct link between the later versions and the original seventeenth-century source text. As a result it makes the irony reproduced in the nineteenth-century translations especially worthy of analysis.

The view of irony in relation to the nineteenth-century reception of *Don Quixote* in England presented by Allen (2009) is only partially in line with that of Close and Russell. Whereas they both argue that *Don Quixote* should be viewed as a funny book throughout, Allen suggests that this is only the case at the start and it then evolves into a more noble and heroic tale. Neither denies the validity of the argument that Cervantes' knight does in fact possess hidden and nobler depths than initially purported by seventeenth-century readers, who saw little if anything beyond the humorous and the slapstick. Likewise, all three of these twentieth-century critics maintain that the true extent of Don Quixote's heroic qualities has a tendency to be overblown, although there is a notable degree of variation in the extent to which this occurs in the eyes of each critic. Allen notes two examples: firstly, the perspectivist approach, which he criticises for looking for endless hidden meanings often not intended to be there; and secondly, he criticises the "ideologues" such as Unamuno (1987, originally published in 1905)<sup>28</sup> and Efron (1971). Allen suggests that their interpretations of Cervantes' novel distort that originally intended by the author so much as to render the finished product almost unrecognisable in comparison, arguing that they create "elaborate, mutually exclusive edifices in which scarcely one stone of the original structure is left upon another" (2008: 116). In other words, although Allen concedes that there is some truth to the notion that Don Quixote is more than a mere comic fool, to accredit Cervantes' protagonist with too many noble and heroic qualities would result in the emergence of a character bearing no resemblance to that originally intended by its creator.

Allen also states that in order to find answers to the many "vexing questions" (2008: 16) regarding the perception and interpretation of *Don Quixote* during the nineteenth century, one must focus initially on the Prologue and Part I of the novel, in order to fully appreciate Part II. He states that, "If, after such an exercise, we readers continue to differ in our responses to the text, as we will, we shall at least be able to see more precisely where and perhaps why this is so" (Ibid). He further advocates the

---

<sup>28</sup> See also Driggers (2011), as well as the entry on Unamuno in Mancing (2004: II, 749).

importance of focusing on irony over any other aspect of the narrative, by pointing out that:

if we can establish the identity of the targets and the limits of the scope of the irony in the initial stages of *Don Quixote*, we can go on to the rest of the novel better prepared to spot the subsequent changes of targets or scope which would necessarily characterise a shift in Cervantes' strategies of irony. (ibid)

Focusing on the changing role of irony over the course of the novel in conjunction with the changing perception of Don Quixote's character, from being the victim of others' ironies to becoming a powerfully ironic voice in his own right, and the extent to which this is mirrored in the nineteenth-century translations, will enable me to draw a clear understanding of how *Don Quixote* was interpreted by readers and critics during the last few decades of the nineteenth century.

In addition to the targets and limits of irony in *Don Quixote*, Allen also touches upon the issue of irony's stability (2008: 115). He points out that these three aspects combine to form an irony which carries a distinct purpose, a "deployment in the service of norms that govern life in the world of Cervantes' masterpiece". Irony is used firstly as a frame upon which to display the social trends and practices of Cervantes' day, and the society which inhabited it. Secondly, it is also used as a detached and almost anonymous mouthpiece through which Cervantes commentates on and critiques the world around him. This is particularly evident in the use of multiple narrators and intermediaries who serve as "extradiegetic filters" (Oriol 1990: 60) during the course of the novel, including Cide Hamete Benengeli and the nameless Moor who translates part of it, as well as Cervantes himself.<sup>29</sup> By remaining aloof from the comments he is voicing, Cervantes succeeds in placing himself in a position where he can be free from reprisal or consequence as a result of his humorous critiquing. My view echoes that of Allen, who states that Cervantes enables himself to express his "moral and ethical discriminations which contemporary criticism has so judiciously sought to avoid" (ibid.).

Eisenberg's is one of the few studies to date which focuses in any detail on irony in *Don Quixote*, as well as confirming its existence among critics as early as the end of the eighteenth century. Eisenberg lists 21 glosses used by Bowle in his edition of *Don Quixote*,

---

<sup>29</sup> A more in-depth analysis is not directly relevant to the focus of my research; see Booth (1972: 163-185), Mancing (1981: 63-81), Oriol (1990: 55-71), Ardila (2009a: 9), Carr (2004) and Mancing (2009a: 111-113) for further reading.

in which Eisenberg states he was “recognising the irony of the text” (in Ardila 2009d: 10). However, like Allen, Eisenberg does little more than list these and provides nothing in the way of any critical analysis. Similarly, Close also makes several allusions to the fact that irony is instrumental, not only for Cervantes but is also utilised heavily by the novel’s Romantic translators.<sup>30</sup> Again, these allusions consist of nothing more than a few relevant phrases scattered throughout the final chapter of his book: his reference to the fact that it is through *Don Quixote* that the concept of “romantic irony is rediscovered” (1978: 244), and that what other critics have described as the novel’s “serious air” is in fact an “elegantly disguised irony intrinsic to the burlesque method” (1978: 247). Close also hints that the function of the subtlety of Cervantes’ message was a means of “steering this comedy of inflated sentiment from burlesque into momentarily imperceptible irony” (1978: 248). On the issue of Cervantes’ use of irony being wholly intentional and deliberate Close makes only a passing reference through the use of a metaphor, noting that it is indicative of “the great comic artist’s delight in his craft; he makes the bubbles of preciosity or vanity or bravado tremble, clumsy yet iridescent, before they burst” (1978: 249). Like Eisenberg’s, there is no denying that Close’s influential comments have contributed to laying the foundations of subsequent pieces of research, demonstrated by critical reviews which describe his book as “well-documented” (Hall 1986: 144) and “much-read” (Sullivan 1980: 114). However, that the ideas he puts forward do not expand the topic of irony in any significant detail is also demonstrated by his reviewers. El Saffar has argued that, whilst Close makes a useful contribution to the field of understanding *Don Quixote*, thanks to the way in which he places our “philosophical presuppositions in context” (1979: 405), she nevertheless noted that his book does little more than a “very effective job of pigeon-holing” (1979: 404).

The most recent notable publication to touch upon the issue of irony in *Don Quixote* in England is *The Cervantean Heritage: The Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain* (2009a), containing several chapters which make reference to Cervantes’ use of irony in *Don Quixote* and how it was understood in England. However, these simply report

---

<sup>30</sup> Although he is strongly opposed to the Romantic approach to *Don Quixote*, Close nevertheless concedes that it Cervantes’ irony is what enables such critics to portray his character as the noble hero, transforming the previously funny story into “...a bitterly ironic epic about the outcast Poet, the heroic Outsider, the victimised Christ-figure; a philosophical epic about the idealising spirit or conceptualising mind before reality; a national epic about a Spain crushed by, or potentially resurgent from its history” (1978: 249).

or acknowledge irony rather than analysing it in significant detail. In the first chapter, Ardila provides an overview of the trends in interpretation of *Don Quixote*, since its publication in the early seventeenth century up until the romantic period in the nineteenth century. This overview includes the recognition of “grave irony”, coined by Addison in his literary essays written for *The Spectator* in 1712 (see Ardila 2009a: 10, 28), in which he gives a further nod to Bowle’s formal acknowledgement of irony as a significant aspect of the Cervantes’ novel (ibid), and also Coleridge’s view of *Don Quixote* as “a fine piece of irony” (2009a: 18). The shortness of the chapters in a book containing contributions from so many authors prevents further exploration of these demonstrations of the significance of irony in *Don Quixote* in great detail. Nonetheless, the opening chapter of *The Cervantean Heritage* alone demonstrates that irony was a key feature of Cervantes’ novel from the very start of its reception in Britain, not just in the nineteenth century. Among the other chapters which follow, the most noticeable considerations of irony are found in those by De Bruyn, entitled ‘The Critical Reception of *Don Quixote* in England: 1605 – 1900’, and Colahan’s ‘Shelton and the Farcical Perception of *Don Quixote* in Seventeenth-Century Britain’. De Bruyn’s supports the conclusions put forward by Ardila previously, building on them to provide a parallel overview of the interpretation of *Don Quixote* over the centuries. He highlights key points in the evolution of the reception of Cervantes’ irony over the centuries, by charting the way it progressed from being viewed in the seventeenth century as “grave” (ibid: 38) before going on to become redefined as “sustained irony” in the following century, and ultimately as “romantic irony” (ibid: 45) by the arrival of the nineteenth.

Unlike De Bruyn’s or Ardila’s chapters noted above, whose analyses covered three centuries, Colahan’s focuses specifically on the seventeenth century. And yet, despite the increased scope for detail that this offers, he does not provide much in the way of a sustained critical analysis of irony in *Don Quixote* either. He briefly refers to “the work’s pervading irony” (2009: 62) and does make a passing attempt to explain why irony was not considered to be as fundamental to the novel during the seventeenth century as it would go on to become during the 18<sup>th</sup>. Once again, however, this analysis is confined to the single sentence “in Britain, conditions would have to settle, the time for irony would have to wait until eighteenth-century writers could return to a lighter touch — and a better appreciation of the polyvalent nature of Cervantes’ text” (2009: 63). In spite of their lack of in-depth analysis, these three studies nevertheless highlighted the importance of irony in *Don Quixote*, thanks to their overall assessments of Cervantes’ masterpiece in its reception in

England. A fuller, more detailed analysis of these important aspects of Cervantes' style therefore remains to be carried out, and it is the aim of this thesis to do so. The vastness of the number of allusions and references made to the issue by critics researching related topics alone demonstrates not only the scope for an exhaustive analysis on the subject of irony in *Don Quixote*, but also the demand and need for one.

It would be unviable in this single study to attempt to analyse all three of the translations from the perspective of more than one linguistic device or feature of the narrative. To create this additional scope would require narrowing the frame of reference to only one, or at a push, two of the nineteenth-century translations, but in doing so any findings and conclusions drawn from would not be representative of late nineteenth-century critical thinking as a whole. Rather, any such research would be merely a snapshot of that one translator's specific approach. Allen has noted that these two extremes are to blame for the existing void in this area. He points out that the majority of studies into irony in Cervantes' novel "are either quite general, and heavily involved with the Romantic paradoxical irony, or very specific and limited" (2008: 117). In order to be able to include all three translations in my analysis, I have therefore chosen to refine my focus to one specific linguistic feature, one which is also the most valuable for understanding the reception of *Don Quixote* in that century. Despite being "masters of irony" (De Bruyn 2009: 45), eighteenth-century writers tended to view it not as the reflection of a "sceptical, demystifying and epistemological mindset", as had been Cervantes authorial intention, but as a "rhetorical trope" (ibid). Later critics and commentators have also not studied the concept of Cervantes' irony in any great depth; Close, for example, only indirectly touched upon the issue of irony as part of his discussion of English Romanticists, and even this discussion only spanned five pages of his book (1978: 244-249). Allen sums the situation up with the succinct observation that "we have not examined the extent and variety of the readers' reactions" to the novel in enough detail (1969: 84).

In its purest original form, irony simply referred to dissimulation or feigned ignorance, stemming from the Greek "εἰρωνεία" (Liddell and Scott, 1892).<sup>31</sup> William Egginton, author of numerous studies into Cervantes and his writing style, has noted that irony is "a deceptively simple trope" which requires nothing more than for a sentence to mean other than what it appears to mean (2002: 1040) or, in other words, a trope in which

---

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.tlg.uci.edu/lj/#eid=32233&context=search> (accessed 9<sup>th</sup> May 2014)

“the artist mocks his own most cherished illusions” (Johnson 1990: 27). Primary sources also support these modern critics’ views: the *OED* cites that in the 16<sup>th</sup> century irony had been a “figure of speech in which the intended meaning is the opposite of that expressed (pretence, as of ignorance, Socratic irony)” (1966: 485); it was a “a nipping jeast, or a speech that hath the honey of pleasantnesse in its mouth, and a sting of rebuke in its taile” (Reyner 1656: 227).

Although this view was still the norm in England during the eighteenth century, during the last decades the arrival of German Romanticism marked a major turning point in what irony looked like.<sup>32</sup> In general comparative terms, eighteenth-century society in England was much freer than during the nineteenth, with less of the social constraints and binding rules around expectations. Whilst it is important to avoid over-generalising, Amelia Rauser has noted in her study into the rise of caricature as a form of ironic expression in London during the eighteenth century, society at that time was “extraordinarily free, both for good and for ill” (2008: 131). Individuals weren’t restricted from the outpouring of emotions the Romantics craved so much, and this illustrated by the emergence of caricature. Taking caricature as an example of irony during the eighteenth century, it was overt, visible, tongue-in-cheek and public. It was a visual representation of a meaning that was different to what was initially stated, nothing more and nothing less. Although differing slightly due to its non-written or verbal form, the strength and success in executing its intended irony is evident in that fact that caricature had become “the preeminent visual language of political representation in the West” (2008: 129) and therefore must not be overlooked when considering the presence of irony in England during the eighteenth century. Written forms of irony at the time also mirrored this, as Samuel Johnson’s entry for irony in his *Dictionary of the English Language* shows: it was, according to him, “a mode of speech in which the meaning is contrary to the words” (1755: 1019). Makaryk too, in her *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory*, reflects on the eighteenth-century view of irony as a “dissimulation of ignorance by one who says other or less than he means” (1993: 572).

The shift in how irony was perceived by critics and readers towards the end of the eighteenth century was significant both in its magnitude and its impact on critical reception.

---

<sup>32</sup> For a list of examples of irony taken from works of literature across the centuries, please see the Oxford English Dictionary’s numerous definitions online for further reference <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/99565?rskey=BA4PSs&result=1#eid> (accessed 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016)

Robert Witkin, in his chapter in Cameron's *Humour and History*, confirms that "the concept of irony (and the forms of literary and cultural practice upon which this concept was brought to bear) underwent a major development, one might also say and explosion" (1993: 137). Irony expanded to become something much more complex, and with a much wider presence in places not seen before. Schlegel was seen as the main driver behind this shift, towards a more advanced irony based on the "recognition of the fact that the world in its essence is paradoxical and that an ambivalent attitude alone can grasp its contradictory totality" (Wellek 1955: 14). Irony is therefore everywhere, without having to be sought. An additional new feature of irony following this shift was the concept of distancing. In the eighteenth century, the criteria to meet had been merely a distancing between what was said and meant, but in its new nineteenth-century manifestation there was now a preoccupation with the distancing between the self and the world around them. Although the latter had been the subject of critical focus during the eighteenth century, it had not necessarily been viewed in conjunction with irony (Cameron 1993: 138). Irony was a form of self-criticism to nineteenth-century readers, with the backdrop of the world around them as a frame of reference.

In terms of what this shift meant for the critical reception of literature, it was significant in that it created an environment in which a Romantic interpretation of a text was almost the default position. The irony of the nineteenth century was ""directed at the impossibility of realising the transcendental in the world" (Cameron 1993: 145), and few texts embody this theme more effectively than *Don Quixote*. Don Quixote's old-fashioned and strange behaviours and beliefs are his attempts to emulate Amadís de Gaula, or as Witkin terms it, his "transcendental pretensions" (Ibid). Since these can never be realised, and therefore Don Quixote will always remain a misunderstood misfit in his contemporary society so long as he maintains them, he is trapped in limbo between the his pretensions and the real world. To a nineteenth-century reader, living in a strictly-governed society corseted by strict religious and social rules and expectations, this lack of freedom to truly express oneself would have been a struggle with which they could relate. This engenders a default position of sympathy and pity, which in turn leads away from a propensity to consider Don Quixote as a deluded fool. As one of the more detailed publications to list characteristics of Romanticism, Sedwick supports this view that Romanticism is the polar opposite of humour, comedy or buffoonery. He notes, among many other traits, that Romanticism consists of "pessimism... dissatisfaction with one's own environment...

nostalgia and melancholy, idealisation, sensitivity” and, most significantly, unlike a foolish buffoon Romantic readers saw a “mysterious hero at odds with society” (1954: 468). Although the terms ‘Romantic reception’ and ‘nineteenth-century reception’ are often erroneously considered to be interchangeable, in this case they do appear to coincide.<sup>33</sup>

What determines this changing ironic effect are the norms governing the context in which an ironic work of literature is read, and how likely these norms are to permit the reader to recognise a disparity between what is being said and inferred. As Hutcheon has put it, irony is “a discursive strategy that depends on context and on the identity and position of both the ironist and the audience” (1994: 178). In other words, the laying of the bait by the author only goes halfway towards successfully conveying irony; the reader must also be equipped with the necessary tools to recognise it. These tools, unique to each reader based on their individual background and experience, can both help or hinder the detection of irony:

It is possible too, when armed with the modern concept of irony, to recover the ironies of the Old Testament and the New and of diverse literatures of the past – just so long as we remember that it is we who are interested in irony and the history we construct reflects that interest, leaving open, for the present, the question of what the relationship such a history has to the events of the time. (Cameron 1993: 148)

Irony may therefore appear more or less prevalent to an individual or society, depending on the wider context to which they are exposed at the time.

The metamorphic qualities of irony over time also call into being an important question; that of whether Allen’s list of 107 instances of irony is either exhaustive or expansive enough. Instead, it provides only a list of instances within Cervantes’ novel which appear ironic to today’s reader.<sup>34</sup> Although the norms steering reader reception of irony do

---

<sup>33</sup> Frederick Garber explores the new branch of irony which emerged at the turn of the nineteenth century in more detail in *Romantic Irony* (1988: 47-50).

<sup>34</sup> As Colebrook has noted, irony today is viewed from a heavily postmodern perspective and is closely linked to the political sphere: “greater stress has been placed on irony that is undecidable and on modes of irony that challenge just how shared, common and stable our assumptions are... We no longer share common values and assumptions, nor do we believe there is a truth or reason behind our values; we always speak and write provisionally, for we cannot be fully committed to what we say.” (2004: 18). See also Wilde (1980) and Lefebvre (1985), as well as an article by Zoe Williams which provides an informal yet up-to-date overview of the evolution of irony over the centuries in *The Guardian* <http://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/2003/jun/28/weekend7.weekend2>, accessed 9<sup>th</sup> May 2014. Examples of recently published ironic literature include Angela Carter’s *The Bloody Chamber* (1979) in which she uses modern adaptations of traditional fairytales to address issues around

appear to change over time, what does not, on the other hand, is irony itself. This is demonstrated by the definition provided by Suárez in 1568, which offers three avenues through which irony can be executed. Although the precise speaker, their words, or the context in which they speak their words will always vary from one instance of irony to another irrespective of the century in which they are spoken, his formula remains applicable among all generations of reader. Irony is and will always be the existence of a variance between what is said and what is meant, and therefore it is not irony itself which changes over time but how different generations of readers interpret it. For those in the seventeenth century, this meant looking beyond merely words, whereas for later readers in the nineteenth century the focus was once again narrowed. Regardless of which temporal filter is applied, the basic premise remains the same.

The term 'Romantic irony' emerged among critics in the 1970s and 1980s, to refer to a perceived sense of indeterminacy in literature and to reflect "a world that is dynamic, open-ended, fraught with dangers and possibilities" (Shiner Wilson & Haefner 1994: 4). It is important to note that many different types of irony existed during the Romantic period, and also that Romantic irony still exists nowadays, long after the movement's conclusion. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between Romantic irony and its classical counterpart. Egginton describes Romantic irony as the biggest single "departure in irony's trajectory" (2002: 1040), one which occurred only relatively recently and was "bequeathed by Romanticism when its poets and preachers chose this trope to be the standard of a new understanding of the human and relation to its world" (Ibid). The birth of Romantic irony is therefore linked directly to the point in *Don Quixote's* critical reception at which readers began to identify with the protagonist and his struggles, and start to view this in the context of their own experiences. Whereas classical irony is largely rhetorical, Romantic irony is philosophical as it refers to more than simply the use of language, and in fact applies to a wider sense of being and consciousness. It is Frederick von Schlegel who is credited with coining the concept of Romantic irony and recognising the distinction between it and its classical predecessor, as "an art that was not merely artifice but that reflected a fundamental – and fundamentally new – way of being" (ibid). Despite what some critics have argued,<sup>35</sup> Romantic irony does allow for the inclusion and recognition of

---

feminism, and a more recent example is Markus Zusak's *The Book Thief* (2006) in which the issues of fascism, war, racism and loss are explored from the unwittingly naïve perspective of a child.

<sup>35</sup> Russell (1969: 97); Close (1978: 2)

the humorous elements of Cervantes' writing. However, in the course of this study the term "irony" will refer to the trope in its broader classical sense, except on specific occasion where this will be stipulated. My interpretation of Romantic irony is based on what I consider to be one of the most comprehensive definitions already coined, one which highlights the epistemological link between each reader's literary background and the wider social, economic and political environment in which they first experience a work of literature, with the particular way in which this reception occurs:

Romantic irony represents the outcropping of subjectivity in its most extreme form. The romanticists fled from an unknowable and intolerable 'reality' into the inner fastness of the self. Romantic irony is thus to be identified, for better or for worse, with this outbreak of subjectivity, a rebellious impulse on the part of the literary artist to rise above the restrictions of reality. (Glicksberg 1969: 5)<sup>36</sup>

Romantic irony, in its melancholic form, is a stark contrast from the parody and satire employed during the seventeenth century and early stages of the 18<sup>th</sup>. The most likely reason for this relationship between a particular era or generation's perception of irony and their reception of *Don Quixote*, or indeed any work of literature, has been well-documented by critics: McGann argues that the emergence of Romantic irony, for instance, stems from theories of Romanticism devised by critics "seduced by Romanticism's own self-representations" (in Wilson and Haefner 1994: 1). As a result, they find themselves becoming priests and clerics who effectively do little more than perpetuate rather than analyse a set of ideas.<sup>37</sup> Similarly, Simpson provides that at its core Romanticism was the expression of a division, either between the individual and society, or within the individual themselves between body and soul. In defining 'Romantic irony', therefore, a key feature is the "inadequate fit between the real and the apparent (...) thus governed by struggle" (1993: 9). It is from this sense of struggle that melancholy and desire become defining characteristics, in that the main difference between specifically 'Romantic' irony and the earlier traditional view is that the former is characterised not by "the peace of understanding, but the anxiety of becoming and wandering" (ibid).

My analysis of irony is not restricted solely to the confines of Romantic irony. Because irony, whether Romantic or otherwise, was fundamental to Romanticism,

---

<sup>36</sup> See also Egginton (2002: 1052-1056) for a further analysis of definitions of irony and the debate which surrounds them.

<sup>37</sup> For a fuller discussion of this relationship see the introductory chapter of Wilson and Haefner (1994: 1-16); and also McGann (1985).

twentieth-century critics such as de Man have recognised it as a “guiding trope” of the movement, specifically because it “allows for no end, for totality” (1983: 208-209). This relationship which de Man and his contemporaries<sup>38</sup> highlight is particularly important in the context of this study, as it leads to a key assumption: that Romanticism in literature cannot exist without irony, whereas irony can exist without the presence of Romanticism. Simpson’s description of what constitutes Romantic writing is it being, among other things, “replete with irony” (1993: 24) has further underpinned the link between the co-existence of one with the other.

What it is important to note at this stage is that more recent definitions of irony have tended to reject the more classical view that irony simply refers to a delta between what is said and what is meant. Behler, for example, described irony in 1990 as “much more than a figure of speech: it is an attitude that underlies and shapes the whole literary text” (in Coromines i Calders 2010: 63); this followed Leech’s slightly earlier definition of irony as a formal “linguistic mechanism”, presented to the reader as a means of inviting them to step forward and investigate a problematic linguistic feature further (1969: 172); for Booth irony was “a rhetorical device by means of which one rejects a surface meaning” (1974: 222), then Grice added to this list by similarly defining irony as a “flouting of maxims” by the speaker, suggesting that further the distance between what is said versus what is meant, the more humorous the effect is intended to be (1975: 49); and this concept was developed even further by Sperber and Wilson, who combined all of the maxims noted by Grice into a means of “echoic second-degree interpretation” (1986: 238). The main difference between these more modern definitions and the classical ones is the degree of active participation by the reader, and the ownership they must take of the relationship they have with the irony contained in a text.

Even beyond the confines of any specific timeframe or movement, or the way in which definitions of irony vary from critic to critic<sup>39</sup>, there is one clear area of common ground between them all: the contrast between what is said or written explicitly and what is being inferred implicitly. Moreover, it is not just the fact that there is merely a degree of

---

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Martín’s chapter of the *Cambridge Companion*, pp. 160-186.

<sup>39</sup> De Bruyn refers only to Romantic irony, which he describes as “a complex idea that addresses the relation between the artist and the work of art, but that is also applied to the condition of human existence itself” (in Ardila 2009a: 45); for Casaldueiro irony is the way in which “frecuentemente el poeta barroco contempla la propia belleza por él creada, esa ironía que forma de confrontar las formas de la imaginación con las de la realidad” (1949:295); see also Close (1973: 237).

contrast between the two meanings, but that they are complete and utter contradictions of one another altogether. According to the *DRAE*, irony is a “burla fina y disimulada; tono burlón con que se dice; figura retórica que consiste en dar a entender lo contrario de lo que se dice”. This definition has also been advocated by the French critic Phillip Hamon in his own study into the general concept of literary irony.<sup>40</sup> Prior to Hamon, Allemann described irony as “un mode de discours, dans le quel une difference existe entre ce qu’on dit litteralement et ce qu’on veut vraiment dire” (1978: 388). But while all three of these variations of this definition of irony clearly convey the element of an opposing contradiction between the connotational and denotational meaning of an ironic statement or phrase, they do not go as far as explaining how this is achieved. Brigitte Adriaensen (2007) builds on the existing definitions of irony to incorporate some degree of explanation. By arguing that irony as a discursive strategy is “un conflicto de sentidos expresados en términos de oposición así como mediante el contraste, la paradoja o la ambivalencia” (2007: 245), she highlights a potential strategy for exploring techniques for creating the ironic divergence between what is said and what is meant.

What this definition does not offer, however, is an indication as to when each of these three ironic techniques should be employed. This lack of a clear explanation of the uses and implementation of irony in literature has also been highlighted by Ardila (2009b) in his study into the picaresque novel in Europe, in which he compares the various definitions of irony offered by recent critics. Ardila cites Pere Ballart’s definition as a possible answer, as Ballart goes further than Adriaensen and offers four distinct levels of irony in literature. The basic, textual, level is indicated by a conflict between intended meanings which will reappear at several points throughout one text. The metatextual, or metafictional, level is reached when the ironic meanings of a text reverberate beyond the confines of a text itself, into its communicative context. The contextual level of irony develops this concept further, underlining the relationship between irony and its audience with the suggestion that irony links the text directly to the historical, social or cultural context in which it is being read. As a result, this particular brand of irony would be extremely useful for research such as this thesis, when retrospectively analysing the reception of a text within a specific century or timeframe. A further reason why this third category of irony applies directly to *Don Quixote* is in relation to the mismatched jarring of

---

<sup>40</sup> “l’art langagier de prendre en garder ses distances vis-à-vis des choses on de soi-même” (Hamon 1996: 109).

the two eras within Cervantes' novel – the early seventeenth century in which it was first received, and the bygone era of chivalry whose values no longer had a place in society by that stage. This leads into Ballart's final level of irony, the intertextual level, which is based on parody and also features heavily in *Don Quixote*.

One of the most enlightening recent analyses of the definition, or multiple definitions, of irony in the context of Cervantes studies is Miguel Ángel Garrido's entry in the *Gran Enciclopedia Cervantina* (2010). Garrido's analysis is brief in comparison to other analyses of irony. However, unlike those studies he looks as far back as a chapter in a sixteenth-century work by Cipriano Suárez, one of the most widely-distributed manuals in Cervantes' day, to explain the function of irony. Even so early on irony was already recognised as a trope; a turn or change in direction if based on its literal meaning, or a rhetorical figure of speech consisting of a play on words when put into a literary-specific context (1562, 11: 15-16; 12: 17-18). This second definition is especially applicable in relation to Cervantes' irony: throughout subsequent centuries and generations of critical approaches to literature since the initial literary rules and norms were established, the classically employed strategy has been to rely on what was said previously and build on those foundations. However, one of the key characteristics of Cervantes' irony – particularly in *Don Quixote* but also in all of his major works – is that it is so innovative and distinct that to look backwards in history for an explanation would not only prove unsuccessful but could be misleading. As one recent critic has put it, central to the importance of *Don Quixote* and its place in European literature is that it represents "la maestría de la obra maestra" (Morón Arroyo 2007: 111). Garrido cites György Lukács, who summarised this view almost a century earlier, when he argued that to view irony as the main constructive principle of epics is the key to the genre of the novel in its modern sense and that *Don Quixote* as a paradigm thus marks a universal shift in the view of irony (2010: 6300).

A further aspect for consideration, when approaching a study of irony in Cervantes' literature, is that it can manifest either consciously or unconsciously. For example, as Ballart has acknowledged, it can be used to place a story or situation into context. It can also be used, however, to reconstruct ironic situations only when the reader applies an ironic perspective to the given scenario, such as sarcasm. According to Suárez' approach there can be three potential agents of irony, or vehicles through which a scenario could be construed as ironic. This can be conveyed via the pronunciation of a particular expression, via the

character saying these words (a form of irony which lends itself well to the satirical reception of *Don Quixote*), or by the nature of the circumstances in which this character is saying them. If any of these three components contradict the literal meaning of what is being said, then the situation can be labelled ironic. In the context of Cervantes' literature, rather than the pronunciation, the speaker and the circumstances these three categories can be regarded as *engaño*, *decoro* and *contexto*.<sup>41</sup> The first, because if the reader does not pick up on the intended sarcasm or word-play then the true intended outcome of the situation will be lost, and therefore the resulting impression they take away from it will be inadvertently false. The second refers to a character acting outside the expected behavioural norms, of which there are many examples in *Don Quixote*; and the third refers to the element of subjectivity on which the reader's interpretation of the circumstances surrounding the speech depends and how this will affect their expectations. A potential stumbling block surrounding this level of subjectivity is the problem that a reader might impose an ironic context onto a situation where there may never have been one originally intended by the author, particularly as the number of years between a work's publication and its reception increases. As will be discussed later in this chapter, one of the main criticisms levelled against the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote*, by critics in the second half of the twentieth-century, was that irony was perceived where none was ever instilled by Cervantes and, as a result of this artificially created irony, Don Quixote's character is thought to have been afforded a more heroic and noble image than should have in fact been the case.

The final manifestation of irony is referred to by Lukács as the "mirada irónica" (quoted in Panesso 2002: 9). This ironic outlook or stance is of central importance in any study of irony in *Don Quixote*, as it perfectly encapsulates the anachronistic juxtaposition of ageing chivalric ideals against a much more modern society. It is, in other words, a search for the impossible and unfeasible chivalric ideals within the confines of what was otherwise, at its time of publication, realistic fiction. In this sense, *Don Quixote* is a work of irony in the purest possible form and a prime example of this is the well-known episode near the beginning of Part I, where Cervantes' knight encounters the farmer Juan Aldudo administering a brutal beating to his servant-boy Andrés at the side of the road. Not only does Don Quixote's well-meant but entirely misguided intervention highlight how far out of

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Suárez (1955); and also Garrido (2010: 6301).

date his chivalric ideals are in the context of early seventeenth-century Spain, but this incident also highlights an issue raised in Hamon's definition of irony: the intended meaning of a situation is not just different from its surface appearance, in fact it is the total opposite. This is brought to the reader's attention at the end of Chapter 1 (II, 31: 334), when Don Quixote comes across Andrés again and the boy goes as far as to beg him "por amor de Diós" not just to refrain from becoming involved, should they find themselves in a repeat of the earlier situation, but to proactively remove himself from it. Garrido argues that it is precisely The technique of unlocking its potential as a communicative tool "de forma magistral" is, as Garrido argues, Cervantes most common form of irony (2010: 6302).

#### 1.4 Background to the nineteenth-century translations

Along with the concept of irony, another area in which there remains an extensive knowledge gap in research carried out so far is the relationship between the translations analysed in this study and their temporal context. Part of the reason why these nineteenth-century translations form the core of my methodology, aside from the lack of existing research carried out in this period, is because when they were produced they were the first translations to be written after more than a century.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, it was during the Romantic period, from the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early nineteenth century onwards, that additional supplementary resources such as prefaces, introductions and commentaries, as well as extratextual resources such as formal essays, lectures and examples of correspondence between prominent literary scholars, began to emerge like never before and were becoming increasingly commonplace. Although it is true that Motteux is credited with having written the first noteworthy preface (to a 1700 re-edition of Boddington's 1699 translation of *Don Quixote*), and Mayans y Siscar wrote a specially requested preface for the 1738 deluxe version of *Don Quixote* commissioned by Lord Carteret for Queen Charlotte's library at Richmond Palace, modern critics agree that it was not until well into the second half of the eighteenth century that formal, organised literary criticism emerged as a recognised phenomenon: De Bruyn has observed that it was not until the nineteenth century that one can observe "the shift in critical focus... to more discursive forms of commentary (which) contributed to a growing sophistication of critical insight" (2009: 49).

---

<sup>42</sup> Since Charles H. Wilmot's translation in 1774, entitled *The History of the Renowned Don Quixote*.

Close had similarly noted that any earlier criticism of Cervantes' novel was "confined to incidental comments and tributes" (1978: 8); and De Bruyn develops this even further when he notes that back in the seventeenth century "theories of literature designed to account for vernacular texts were as yet barely conceived of" (2009: 34), going on to state that in fact the majority of "early reactions to the novel are difficult to assess because the evidence is so meagre" (ibid). The inclusion of more comprehensive and thorough paratexts therefore makes the nineteenth-century translations all the more worthy of critical attention.

The explosion of formal literary criticism and commentary that emerged in Britain during the nineteenth century is mirrored by an increase in the number of theatrical adaptations of *Don Quixote*: examples in the eighteenth century include Ayres (1742) and Pilon (1785) and, in the first half of the nineteenth century, Almar (1833) and Stewart (1834), which were later followed by Morrison (1895).<sup>43</sup> Morrison's is significant because he was also a well-established literary critic, and so his adaptation evidences the overlaps between the two forms of commentary which had emerged by that point. It is important to consider that printed forms offer a greater degree of scope and flexibility in terms of the readers' responses than visual performances, as they can be interpreted by each individual reader as they see appropriate. Readers are not bound by the external pressures that a member of the audience at the theatre may experience, such as to laugh only in the 'right' places when other members of the watching crowd were also. That said, unlike written novels these theatrical adaptations catered for the majority of a society in which literacy rates were low, but nevertheless a society which craved a new form of entertainment. Theatre was, by the middle of the seventeenth century, becoming less of a luxury pastime reserved only for society's elite. As well as appealing to a female theatregoers in a way that had previously not been deemed respectable, the theatre also attracted members of the newly emerging middle-class. The term coined by Catie Gill, "the bourgeoisification of the theatre", perfectly encapsulates these changes underway in English culture during the second half of the seventeenth century, and the importance of theatre's role in them. This surge was also undoubtedly linked to Shakespeare's rise to fame and cultural dominance in the later stages of the seventeenth century, following his death in the same year and month as Cervantes.

---

<sup>43</sup> See Ardila (2009a: 19) for further discussion of these theatrical adaptations and their role in the reception of *Don Quixote* in the nineteenth century

What is also an important issue for consideration during the study of *Don Quixote* in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but particularly during the nineteenth, is the percentage of the reading public that would have been sufficiently familiar with the Spanish language to be able to read Cervantes' original, instead of relying solely on translations. The importance of this question lies in the fact that if the majority of English readers of *Don Quixote* had never, nor would ever, read the Spanish source text, then the importance of the role played by the translations is pivotal in determining how readers in England saw him. The only impression of this novel that readers would form would be the one Duffield, Ormsby and Watts offered, which would in turn have been influenced by earlier translations produced by the likes of Shelton (1612), Motteux (1700), Smollett (1755), Kelly (1769) and Wilmot (1774), among others. This is particularly relevant in the case of Ormsby's, as it was he out of the three who came from an academic literary background<sup>44</sup> and was therefore more likely to have studied earlier translations in more depth than the other two. Burton highlighted this influence of the legacies left behind by earlier translations when he pointed out that when George Kelly produced his translation all he had done "was in fact to reprint Motteux's version of 1700... with the significant addition of nine words" (1968: 13).<sup>45</sup> If Duffield and Watts had not read these, they would not have been in a position to produce a translation which met the expectations of their late nineteenth-century readers.

Such a view is still echoed by modern critics today. Bal, for example, has highlighted the potential power of the relationship between the translator and the source text for good or evil, when he noted that "in order to express another character's point of view, the narrator has previously sifted it through his/her own personal filters" (1987: 117). In this case, the narrator in this statement becomes the translator, and in the case of Ormsby it explains why his academic and professional background in the study of Hispanic literature and the Spanish language enabled him to apply "filters" that were more conducive to producing a successful translation than his two peers. Likewise, Wilson and Sperber have

---

<sup>44</sup> After briefly studying Chemistry during his degree at the University of London in 1846, Ormsby then embarked on a career in the legal profession. He was admitted to Middle Temple but was never called to the bar, and around this time he began to write regularly for a number of London-based journals and publications. By the 1860s and '70s his writing career was in full swing, including a well-received translation of *El Cid* in 1879.

<sup>45</sup> For a further analysis of how the translations produced in the nineteenth century built directly on those produced in the eighteenth century, which in turn built on those produced in the seventeenth century, see Burton (1968: 13-15); Staves (1972: 193-215); (Wood 2005: 6-8) and Ardila (2009a:22).

pointed out that “all communication takes place at a risk. The communicator’s intentions cannot be decoded or deduced, but must be inferred by a fallible process of hypothesis formation and evaluation; even the best hypothesis may turn out to be wrong” (1992: 67). For source texts written in English, there is therefore one layer to this risk – the passing of the text from the author to the reader. However, Wilson and Sperber’s argument becomes increasingly relevant in the context of translations as it adds an additional layer of risk: the text now has to pass from the original author, via the translator, to the reader. Whereas before the successful or unsuccessful detection and interpretation of irony depended solely on the reader, it now depends on the translator as well.<sup>46</sup>

A further significance of this relationship between translations and their legacies is in relation to the higher literacy levels in the latter stages of the nineteenth century compared to the seventeenth or eighteenth.<sup>47</sup> The knock-on effect of this greater number of people who had access to any of the translations of *Don Quixote* is that there would be more pressure on the nineteenth-century translators to retain as much fidelity to the source text as possible, since there would be a greater degree of accountability than if their readers had nothing to compare the translations to. Watts’ translation supports the linking relationship between the target readers’ knowledge of the Spanish language and the degree of fidelity shown in the translation process, but from the opposite perspective. He states in the translator’s preface to his version that his is in fact aimed at “those not absolutely ignorant of Spanish” (1888: vi), but goes on to contradict himself by saying that, despite this, he has “not hesitated to take the best English word wherever I found it, holding fast to my one purpose, which is to give *Don Quixote* his best English dress” (1888: vi-vii). He seems unconcerned by the fact that his readers may notice the differences between his version and the source text, a concern which Ormsby earlier shared in his own introduction. Ormsby does not specify who his version is aimed at, and whilst on one hand he believes that “fidelity to the method is as much a part of the translator’s duty as fidelity to the matter” (1885: 8) he concedes that, when the possibility of maintaining both is out of the question, then nineteenth-century expectations dictate that fidelity to the author’s style must be maintained at the expense of fidelity to the story itself. Of the three, it is Duffield who most openly advocates the greatest fidelity in translation. His version was

---

<sup>46</sup> cf. Linder (2010: 122-126) for further discussion of the precariousness of the translation process.

<sup>47</sup> See David Mitch’s article entitled ‘The Spread of Literacy in Nineteenth-century England’ for further exploration of this topic and the potential causes of the increase.

actively intended to make *Don Quixote* available to readers beyond the nobility and into less literate circles, and he employs the use of mimesis rather than diegesis in order to achieve this: the statement in his Translator's Note of his desire to "enable all classes of reader to see the Ingenious Knight through a clean glass" (1881: xlii) confirms this.

The way each translator incorporated the legacy of their predecessors in their respective versions also demonstrates why translations of *Don Quixote* were instrumental to the process of its reception in England. Duffield informs the reader that he first became familiar with *Don Quixote* in its original Spanish, only reading an English translation just before he set about producing his own (1881: xlii). He never specifies which translation this was, although he later holds Shelton's version up as "the best of all translations, but it is out of date" (1881: xliii). Ormsby openly acknowledges his indebtedness to Hartzbusch's translation (1885: 11), and although Watts states that his is based on what he regards as the "best" translation, that produced by the Academia Española in 1819, which was the fourth of their critical editions (1888: v), it would be impossible to presume that earlier translations have not also exerted some degree of influence. In comparison to these earlier versions, critical evidence<sup>48</sup> suggests that the three translations produced by Duffield, Ormsby and Watts were especially important. Close suggests that the main flaw in criticism of *Don Quixote* prior to the nineteenth century is that nearly all of it comes from critics whom he describes as "non-specialists", such as historians of comparative literature, aestheticians, philosophers and those who, despite being "meditators about Spain's position in history", cannot be considered specialised *cervantistas* (1978: 51). In contrast, he argues that in the nineteenth century translations were produced from the perspective of hispanists, *cervantistas* and critics of Hispanic literature, and that Duffield, Ormsby and Watts had taken an approach "launched by gifted non-specialists" and gone on to turn it into one now being "carried forward by the professionals" (1978: 245) in a way that was more academic.

As well as the questions of how many translations will be analysed in this study, of how and why these translations are linked to the interpretation of *Don Quixote* in England during the nineteenth century, and the importance of this role, the final issue regarding the methodology of this research is the decision to focus particularly on the English reception. Although editions of the source text were already circulating in England in 1605, the same

---

<sup>48</sup> See the chapters by Ardila, De Bruyn and Mayo & Ardila in Ardila (2009a) in particular.

year as its publication in Spain, critics are unanimous that it was not until Thomas Shelton's translation was produced in 1612 that Cervantes' masterpiece became widely available in English (Burton 1968; Luteran 2010; Ardila 2009a; Colahan 2009; McGrath 2009; Wood 2005; Paulson 1998). Despite this, the fact remains that the first copies of Part I of *Don Quixote* appeared in England in 1605 in Oxford University Library<sup>49</sup> and therefore would have been available in some circles. By admitting in the letter which prefaces his translation, published in London in 1612, that he had actually written his translation "some five or six years ago" (Carr 2004: 3; Mayo and Ardila 2009a: 60), Shelton has famously created a degree of ambiguity surrounding the date of his publication.

Notwithstanding this ambiguity, it is true that if these editions had been in English they would have spread much faster and earlier than if they were restricted to being received only among those who had sufficient command of the Spanish language to be able to read the source text. Either way, it shows that the English readership were already becoming familiar with Cervantes' novel from 1605 onwards, albeit only the higher social classes. For example, at the christening of the Spanish Prince Felipe in Valladolid in May 1605, the invited guests were entertained by watching a bullfight. During the intermission they were treated to a brief presentation of the first part of Cervantes' novel. Among these guests was the Earl of Nottingham, sent on behalf of King James I of England, and verbal accounts of the story will have made their way back to England and been shared with his contemporaries and fellow courtiers in London. These would have been only aristocratic or politically well-connected members of society, and so to say that English readers en masse were beginning to become familiar with *Don Quixote* or Cervantes at that stage would be premature. This began to change gradually over the next decades and by late 1614 other works such as Cervantes' *Novelas ejemplares* had already been translated into French (Haen & Dhondt 2009: 159). Because of the importance of the French language during the Middle Ages and into the seventeenth century, and its role as a *lingua franca*, even those who did not speak Spanish would arguably have had at least some command of French or Latin. They would therefore have been able to read these existing translations produced by French translators and familiarise themselves with Cervantes, even if not *Don Quixote* specifically. Nor is it true that the knowledge and awareness of *Don Quixote* was limited to

---

<sup>49</sup> This was bought from a sum of £100 bequeathed to the Bodelian Library by Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton for the purpose of buying Spanish books. Cf. Randall and Boswell (2009: 1) and Gustav Ungerer (1997: 33)

the higher social classes; this is because it was not restricted solely to the form of written literature. Despite the fact that this period was the Golden Age of English Theatre (Cook 1996), audiences were not yet aware that the plays produced in the early 1600s, such as Francis Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (first performed in 1607 but not published until 1613), were based on *Don Quixote*. In an epistle to his business partner, with whom he would subsequently reinvent and rescue the failed theatre production in printed form, Walter Burre famously stated that this was largely because they did not recognise "the privy mark of Ironie about it", a remark which is one of the first known occasions when the significance of the ironic essence of Cervantes' work was critically acknowledged.<sup>50</sup> Nevertheless, those plays unwittingly undertook a huge role in laying the foundations for the dissemination of awareness and understanding of the story of Cervantes' Manchegan knight. As a result of these plays those who could read neither English nor Spanish were still able to experience what they would later identify as *Don Quixote*, through one form of the arts or another, from the earliest decades of the seventeenth century onwards.

When *Don Quixote* first appeared to English readers it was seen as little more than a "a simple or frivolous book, good only for a guffaw in the digestion-hour after dinner" (Close 1978: 244), a "funny book" (Russell 1969; Close 2000: 1), a "jest book" (Duffield 1881: vi; Gayton 1654; De Bruyn 2008: 34) and its protagonist merely a "fool" (Staves 1972: 206; Cro 2008: 234; Allen 1969; Allen 2008). It was seen merely as a source of entertainment, which was achieved using two literary techniques: parody and satire. The parodic elements of *Don Quixote* was the focus of much speculation during the novel's early reception, with some critics initially interpreting it as a tool for parodying those Spanish values and cultural belief systems upheld by the chivalric romances that had dominated literature until this point, but which were becoming increasingly regarded as outdated and out of fashion in Spain. The eighteenth century was regarded as "the age of satire" (Close 1978: 10), but subsequent revision of critical thinking has led to a more lenient stance being adopted and it now seems there has been a general consensus since the mid-eighteenth century that Cervantes was in fact parodying nothing more than an obsolete literary genre, which no longer had a place in contemporary society. Although the object of the parody is arguably unclear, the fact remains that one of the main functions of

---

<sup>50</sup> Zachary Lesser (1999: 22-43) explores how Burre, in conjunction with Robert Keyzar, turned around the fortunes of this play to become a commercial success.

Cervantes' novel was undeniably parody. This view dovetails perfectly with views from critics even today, who have defined parody as a means of marking the decline of one literary genre and the emergence of another (Ardila 2009a: 15). In this particular case, the old chivalric romances decline to make way for the rise of the novel. Close has argued that the main manifestation of Cervantes' parody is through the use of both high and low burlesque, literary techniques beginning in the seventeenth century and hugely popularised in the following century. The burlesque technique involved either the attribution of a grand, elevated, often excessively literary manner to something ordinary or commonplace, to achieve "mock-heroic" (Close 1978: 1; 2000: 68; De Bruyn 2008: 35) known as 'high burlesque'. This is counterbalanced by its alternative form, involving the assignment of common, irreverent or even mocking qualities to what would normally be considered an example of grand subject matter, dubbed 'low burlesque'.

Although the view of *Don Quixote* as a parody and satire which utilises the technique of the burlesque has remained constant since the seventeenth century, the importance and extent of these aspects of *Don Quixote's* identity has varied. In line with the fact that the story of *Don Quixote* was initially viewed as a source of comic entertainment whose protagonist was a crazed fool, Don Quixote's character was also seen as a source of laughter. Allen describes those who adhere to this view as "hard-headed readers who distrust schwärmerei" and for whom Don Quixote is "the butt of the satire" (2008: 12). However, from as early as the first half of the eighteenth century critics also tended to agree that, whilst the satirical and therefore comical function of *Don Quixote* still remained, this was no longer its sole function (Allen 1969: 48; 2008: 12-13). Instead, readers were gradually beginning to identify with Cervantes' protagonist as well as with his folly (Donahue 2008: 182; De Bruyn 2008: 40; Beattie 1776: 605; Samuel Johnson 1959, III: 11). In fact, it was this initial shift which began in the early 1700s and which critics have termed the "shift towards sensibility" (Close 1978: 52), or "shift towards idealisation" (Allen 1969: 5) which marked the beginning of the long and gradual road to the later Romantic interpretations of *Don Quixote*. As Hayes has highlighted, this shift triggered the transition from "seeing the main character as a purely extravagant, ridiculous figure to considering him in universal terms" (2009: 68). Although Don Quixote was still far from the idealised hero that he would become during the extremes of the Romantic reception, the transition was now slowly underway.

Put simply, *Don Quixote* began its journey as a humorous work of satire in the seventeenth century, and by the time it reached the nineteenth century it had come to be interpreted as the story of a Romantic hero's struggle against a cruel society. The period in the middle, encompassing the eighteenth century, is less easily classifiable. As Staves has noted, "there is of course no very tidy progression from the early satiric Quixote to the later Romantic Quixote" (1972: 204). And although there is no clear answer to this problem I would argue that the process of the changing interpretation of *Don Quixote* can be seen to pass through four overlapping and interconnected stages, each of which can be catalogued according to their relationship with Don Quixote's character. Allen first established this time-frame (1969 & 1979), and has re-examined it more recently (2008) in the course of which his two versions are updated and amalgamated. During the first stage, which occurs during the majority of the seventeenth century, the response that the protagonist evokes from the reader is one of laughter. By the second quarter, or at the very least by the second half of the eighteenth century, readers are beginning to identify with Don Quixote's mistakes, errors in judgement and ambitions, and therefore relate to him as a person. The fact that they are able to relate to a character in this way whose story unfolds nearly 150 years earlier is a partial testament to the timelessness that Cervantes' novel has acquired over the years. The third phase has been described by one critic as the stage during which the reader's view of Don Quixote becomes "wholly sympathetic" (Staves 1972:206), mirroring Close's use of the term "sentimentality": it is during this stage that readers do not just identify with the knight, but their own emotions enter the equation now as they also begin to pity him (Ardila 2009a: 152). Critics such as Allen have highlighted the importance of this third phase because it was this stage that "constitute(s) the seeds of the Romantic interpretation" (2003: 43) which dominated nineteenth-century critical thinking in England. This third phase in the ever-changing interpretation of *Don Quixote* finally gives way to the "admiration" phase (2008: 13), which occurred during the Romantic movement, at which time Don Quixote is revered and exalted to a hero's stature that is almost Christ-like.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Raysor (1936: 99) and Donahue (2008: 185)

## CHAPTER 2: THE RECEPTION OF 'DON QUIXOTE' IN ENGLAND

### 2.1 Shifts in the reception of *Don Quixote*: three stages, three centuries?

Cervantes in the seventeenth century has been the object of numerous studies,<sup>52</sup> and as such it would be unnecessary to analyse this matter in any further detail here. Although his novel began life among its readers as a comic book, by the middle of the century this view had gradually begun to give way to allow for a more satirical reception, as readers began to identify something of themselves within both the protagonist and his story. Two other factors also worthy of consideration are the sheer volume of existing work in this area,<sup>53</sup> as well as the general consensus of those studies. What I do consider necessary to focus on at this stage, however, is the commonplace misconception (with the exception of Ardila 2009a: 2-31) that the reception of Cervantes' novel from the time of its publication until the nineteenth century can be divided into a three-stage process, clearly cut along century lines.

There has been a tendency among critics to simplistically reduce the evolution of *Don Quixote* and its protagonist from comic fool to hero, via a satirical figure whose story embodied the former whilst hinting at elements of the latter, and in doing so this process has been reduced to one which falls within three distinct chronological categories. With the rise to predominance of the theatre in seventeenth-century England, as well as other factors such as the protagonist's outdated language, beliefs and customs, it is hardly surprising that *Don Quixote* was interpreted initially as a funny book. In the prologue of Part 1 the author-narrator, who describes himself as the "padraastro de *Don Quijote*"<sup>54</sup> advises us that "si bien caigo en la cuenta, este vuestro libro... es una invectiva contra los libros de caballerías... aborrecidos de tantos y alabados de muchos más" (49). This already provides the first clue that the story which follows will be a parody, and Don Quixote's character very much lives up to these expectations. Unlike the strong, handsome protagonists the readers of romances were used to, Cervantes' main character is old,

---

<sup>52</sup> Burton (1968); Staves (1972); Ardila (2009a: 1-31, 32-53; 2009b; 2010); Wilson (1948); Russell (1969); Parker (1956); Randall & Boswell (2009).

<sup>53</sup> See Auden (2001), Russell (1969), Fernández Morera and Hanke (2005) and Close (2000) among others.

<sup>54</sup> Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote de La Mancha*, (New York: Random House Vintage Español), 2002, p44 – all subsequent references will be taken from this edition.

socially unaware to the point where he regularly offends people with his arrogance, he rides a haggard elderly horse and wears ramshackle armour patched up with cardboard in places. Furthermore, while most knights boasted brave and heroic specialist skills in life relevant to their profession, Don Quixote informs the reader during a conversation with his niece that his talents instead lie in making birdcages and toothpicks (584).

There is also a more hidden and subversive humour within the narrative, as Eisenberg has explored in detail already. He suggests that there is a darker humour deployed towards the region of La Mancha, which he describes as one of Spain's "least attractive regions: the treeless, desert-like, under-populated plain of La Mancha" (1984: 64). He highlights the fact that, in their travels all over Europe and through parts of Asia Minor in pursuit of knightly success, knights and their squires spent a large amount of time in countries like England or Greece. These were countries "noted for their 'chivalric' history" (ibid), but the majority of whose population would not have visited Spain before. Readers from those nations would therefore be unaware that La Mancha, out of all the regions of Spain, is an unlikely place for a knight of Don Quixote's perceived stature to begin their quest for fame and renown. Eisenberg even argues that the name 'Don Quixote *de La Mancha*' (my emphasis) is "one of the most prominent jokes of the book" (1984: 65).<sup>55</sup> Johnson has supported this argument, by drawing a direct and unfavourable comparison between the chivalric title belonging to Don Quixote de La Mancha and one of the most notable chivalrous literary figures upon which his character is thought to be based, Amadís de Gaula:

Gaula is exotic, a place of mystery, associated with both the Carolingian and the Arthurian cycles of chivalric fiction, a kind of mythic homeland of all the values of chivalry. La Mancha, on the other hand, is a word that means 'stain' in Spanish, and is the name of a region with nothing particular to recommend it: no cities, no illustrious families, and the site of no important historical events, a semi-arid plain given over mostly to wheat and dotted with windmills. (1990:43)

While these two descriptions may seem somewhat bold and contentious, what is more believable is the tongue-in-cheek layer hidden beneath remarks from the narrator, such as the statement that Don Quixote is famous "not just in Spain, but throughout La Mancha".

---

<sup>55</sup> Although Eisenberg has since reversed some aspects of the views he puts forward in this publication, which went on to become his book '*Don Quixote as a Classic*' (1987), those are only in relation to his belief that Cervantes achieved in creating a classic and not just a comedy, and do not affect his comments on La Mancha.

Another example is the description of Dulcinea, described as not only being “the most beautiful creature in the world, but even the most beautiful in La Mancha” (Eisenberg 1987: 116),<sup>56</sup> when in fact the reader already knows by this point that she is a made-up character whose role is stepped into by a plain and common peasant girl at the very last minute.

Critical study of this debate has and continues to offer contradictory conclusions: on the one hand, Staves summarises the evolution of *Don Quixote*'s reception in England from its initial publication to the present day in just three sentences. She states that, “At first we see Don Quixote as a buffoon, a madman who belongs in a farce. Then ambiguities begin to creep in, and we have a Don Quixote who is still ridiculous and still a buffoon but who, at the same time, is beginning to look strangely noble or even saintly. Then, finally, towards the end of the century we begin to glimpse the Romantic Don Quixote, an idealistic and noble hero.” (1972: 193) The slow ‘creeping-in’ of ambiguities further supports my argument that this was a gradual process, and one which would be difficult to pin-point to an exact year or decade. Moreover, Staves refers to the fact that the idealistic and noble hero is already being ‘glimpsed’ by the end of the eighteenth century – earlier than has been suggested by advocates of the three-stage theory based on centuries. Staves then contradicts herself when she refers to the “burlesque humour enjoyed by seventeenth-century readers” (1972: 194) without any distinction between those at the beginning and those at the end of that century.<sup>57</sup> She does acknowledge that pre-Restoration readers viewed Cervantes’ novel as yet another of the chivalric romances that Cervantes’ set out to parody, and she further acknowledges that by the following century the general reception had shifted away from a negative view of the novel and even began to make the shift towards satire. In spite of this, there is no analysis given to the key period covering the majority of the second half of the seventeenth century, when this shift was already underway. This is something that a number of critics were guilty of, including Werner Von Koppenfels, who refers broadly to “the epoch’s satiric and farcical approach to *Don Quixote*” when describing the seventeenth century (2005: 25), however this remark does firmly indicate that the first century of *Don Quixote*'s reception in England was not limited to a solely comic interpretation, regardless of the fact that it started out as such.

---

<sup>56</sup> It is, however, worth noting that in a prefatory note in a subsequent reprint of that same article Eisenberg changes his stance on whether *Don Quixote* should be read as a funny book, stating that “while I believe Cervantes did indeed set out to write a funny book, *Don Quixote* is a classic purely because he wrote a different, and richer, book than he intended” (2002: 1).

<sup>57</sup> See also Koeppel (1898: 87-98); and Becker (1902).

## 2.2 Formal Literary Criticism and the Interpretation of *Don Quixote*

One factor that sets the earliest stages of the reception of *Don Quixote* in England apart from later ones is a lack of any formal tradition of literary criticism in England at this time. According to Close, the only form of indication of how readers had interpreted Cervantes' novel during those decades could be "inferred from imitations of the novel on stage or in fiction", but that these were at best "more rewarding as expressions of insight than explicitly formulated opinions" (1978: 8). Such "imitations" include Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1607), Butler's *Hudibras* (1663-78), and D'Urfey's *Comical History of Don Quixote* (1694), and Fielding's play *Don Quixote in England* (1727-28) to name only a few.<sup>58</sup> Further acknowledgement of this lack of critical tradition comes from Russell, who highlights the link between the lack of the Ancients' writings on comic or humorous elements and how this resulted in critics and readers during the early stages of *Don Quixote's* reception finding themselves in "new, unknown territory" (1969: 319). De Bruyn further points out that "Cervantes' novel appeared to supply a glaring lack in the literary models bequeathed by antiquity" (2009: 36). This void in the place of formal literary criticism prior to *Don Quixote's* reception in England meant that shifts in critical opinion surrounding literature were therefore not only slower to manifest, but also more difficult to instigate in their earliest days than during subsequent centuries.<sup>59</sup>

Several factors contributed to this void. The most obvious is the fact that, in relative terms, so few could read at the start of the seventeenth century. Bennet has, however, noted that over the course of the seventeenth century the situation improved (1970: 80), and as the proportion of the population able and eager to read increased so did confidence within the publishing industry. Increased demand, coupled with increased willingness to supply, encouraged booksellers to become increasingly "knowledgeable and adventuresome" (Randall and Boswell 2009: xviii) in the titles they were willing to stock.

---

<sup>58</sup> See Canvaggio (2006) for further analysis of these.

<sup>59</sup> The lack of a tradition of formal, recognised literary criticism is indicated by Ronald Hilton (1947), in an article entitled 'Four Centuries of Cervantes: The Historical Anatomy of a Best-Selling Masterpiece', in which he notes that the number of versions of *Don Quixote* produced in England during the three centuries following its publication and reception is significantly lower during the seventeenth century than the eighteenth and nineteenth respectively. He calculates that "eleven editions are listed for the seventeenth century, sixty-eight for the eighteenth, and 176 for the nineteenth" (1947: 319), and also further demonstrates quantitatively that this trend followed the same pattern in France and Germany too.

Despite the lack of volumes of formal literary criticism as we would recognise it from a twenty-first century context, there is in fact a great deal of information on offer which provides an insight into reader expectations and literary tastes at the time present in works such as those listed above. By exploring these, it sheds significant light on what factors were present that are likely to have influenced the reception of *Don Quixote* at the time. Taking Butler's *Hudibras* as an example, this perfectly illustrates the popularity of the literary arts and the freedom they offered once again since the end of the Civil War and Cromwell's Protectorship: published in 1684 when monarchist sentiment was extremely high compared to before, the relentless satirical attack aimed at those characters based on key Parliamentary figures was extremely well received among readers. In the decades following its publication there are believed to be more than twenty-five imitations produced, including the anonymous *The Bath Comedians* (1753), Ned Ward's *Hudibras Redivivus* (1707) and the anonymous *In Imitation of Hudibras: The Dissenting Hypocrite, or Occasional Conformist; with Reflections on Two of the Ring-Leaders* (1704). Moreover, before Butler could get his second part published there were already numerous pirate versions in circulation, such was the demand for more among English readers of the day. What is even more telling is that it is believed that the first pirate version to accompany Part I was printed by the Butler's own publisher.<sup>60</sup> Evidence that this demand was sustained into the middle of the seventeenth century is provided by the publishing of a new edition of *Hudibras* in 1727, accompanied by engravings by one of the leading artists of the day, William Hogarth. Praise for Butler's work was far-reaching, with Voltaire even stating in his *Letters Concerning the English Nation* that "I never found so much wit in one single book" than in *Hudibras* (1741: 168). The significance of all of this demand for Butler's work, or cheaper imitations of it, in the context of understanding *Don Quixote*'s critical reception at the time is that it shows how popular the humour-based and satirical elements still were, even at the end of the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth.

That being said, evidence from other key works of literature published around that time also shows that the satirical and comedy-based side to *Don Quixote*'s critical reception was slowly beginning to take a back seat, to a more sympathetic and noble portrayal that was now in its infancy. Like *Hudibras*, D'Urfey's *A Comical History of Don Quixote* also

---

<sup>60</sup> "When the legitimate author's edition in small eight volumes came out in 1663, another smaller edition, the size of a spurious one, appears to have been published at the same time, by the same publishers, probably to compete in cheapness with its rival." (William Lowndes 1862: 334).

provides a wealth of critical insight, not least because it was the first theatrical adaptation of Cervantes' masterpiece to be performed on stage in the English theatre (Ardila 2009a: 8). D'Urfey's work did not usually receive positive reviews from his contemporary critics, one example being a description by his contemporary Gerard Langbaine of how "the Cuckow makes it is business to suck other birds' eggs" (1691: 179). Thomas Shadwell, another literary critic of his day, referred to D'Urfey as "A brave court mixture; for he is at once a Debauchee / a Knave / a Fool / a Dunce" (1682: 10), and Gould's poem is even more scathing:

Think, Ye vain Scribbling Tribe, of Shirley's Fate,  
You that Write Farce, and You that Farce Translate,  
Shirley! the Scandal of the Ancient Stage,  
Shirley! the Very Drf-y of his Age,  
Think how he lies in Duck-lane Shops Forlorn,  
And never mention'd but with utmost Scorn. (*Tory Poets: A Satyr*, 1685)

*A Comical History* appears to have been initially received as no exception to the established trend, and it was initially criticised for being too comical for audience's tastes at the time and offering the portrayal of the protagonist that was too shallow. However, Ardila cites numerous examples, both from the preliminary accompaniments to D'Urfey's script, and also from the spoken lines of several of the characters, which prove that this initial judgement may have been too hasty and there are in fact several examples of evidence of an increasingly more noble and heroic portrayal (2009a: 8). Not only does his play prove that tides in critical reception of Don Quixote were beginning to turn by the end of the seventeenth century, the fact that such a significant message comes from an unlikely source makes it all the more noteworthy.

As well as looking to plays and poems that were influenced by Don Quixote for an insight into the factors shaping its critical reception, another major source of intelligence comes from the translations being published at the time. In conjunction, looking at how those translations were subsequently received will tell yet more. John Phillips' translation of *Don Quixote*, published in 1687, differed in almost no way whatsoever from Shelton's earlier translation (Mayo and Ardila 2009: 55). As a result, Phillips' offering was seen as being just as humorous in its portrayal of the protagonist as Shelton's translation seventy-five years earlier. The lack of evolution between Shelton's and Phillips' version is also evident from the subtitle carried by the latter, "Now made English according to the humour of our Modern Language". Trying to shoehorn a work of literature that had appealed to

tastes almost a century earlier, into a generation of readers whose tastes were steadily moving away from the purely comical reception meant that Phillips' version was not well received. Peter Motteux was one of the first to criticise it, accusing Phillips in the Preface to his own translation of having "changed the Sense, ridiculed the most Serious and Moving passages" (1700). Captain John Stevens, a fellow critic who revised Shelton's translation in the same year, argued that Phillips' was so bad it "cannot be called a translation... truly a disgraceful performance, coarse and clowning" (1700: xii). The fact that Phillips' version was so scathingly received, combined with the fact that he had kept it in the older humours and comic style, provides a very straightforward conclusion regarding literary tastes at the end of the seventeenth century. Like in the case of the criticism offered by other works inspired by *Don Quixote* discussed above, the translations produced at the time also show that by now readers more to see more than just buffoonery with no greater depths.

### 2.3 *Don Quixote's* reception in relation to its temporal context.

On a similar basis, early seventeenth-century readers would have been affected by contemporary external factors such as humanism and rationalism, looking to influences such as ancient Greece and Rome (Burke 1990: 2), the advocacy of ideology based on reason, ethics and justice, whilst rejecting religious dogma and the supernatural as a basis for decision-making (Wilson 1948: 29). Such an outlook would explain why the fantastic giants, monsters and over-idealised *damas* in Don Quixote's head were so hilariously ridiculous to readers during the early stages of the seventeenth century. Auden further illustrates this theory when he notes that, of the four different categories of hero identified in his discussion, *Don Quixote* best fits into that of the comic hero<sup>61</sup> and this is in no small part due to the temporal proximity of the period during which the novel's reception was occurring to the themes and issues it was originally intended to parody (2004: 75). More recent critics, when looking back on the initial reception of *Don Quixote* in England, have tended to regard this process of viewing *Don Quixote* in such a way as "superficial" (Ardila 2009a: 7), and in light of the lack of literary criticism produced until the latter stages of the eighteenth century, such opinions are justified.

---

<sup>61</sup> As opposed to its tragic, epic or Christian counterparts. See Auden (2001: 74-76) for further discussion of this topic.

In spite of the complications caused by the close proximity of the novel's publication and the earliest stages of its reception in England, at the same time this also carries unique benefits. In particular, the greater appreciation of and familiarity with the very subject that Cervantes had set out to mock. Due to their greater temporal proximity to the romances of chivalry, compared to readers in the late-seventeenth and eighteenth century, to earlier readers the genre would have been less distant and alien concept. Or, as one critic has noted, "we must also remember how much more vivid the burlesque attitude to *Don Quixote* must have been to the seventeenth century than it is to us today" (Wilson 1948: 3). One thing recent critics have agree on is that, in the event of a contrasting view held by readers of previous generations or centuries, this should not be regarded as wrong or incorrect but simply that it must be understood in conjunction with the wider context surrounding it: Azorín argues that just because Cervantes' contemporaries regarded *Don Quixote* as a funny book, does not in any way suggest that they misunderstood it (1913: 145). On the contrary, its widespread fame and literary influence, as well as the inclusion of more than one *Aprobación* in each issue during its early years in England, demonstrates how highly regarded Cervantes' novel in fact was (Close 1978: 9).

At the same time, the reality is that by the arrival of the seventeenth century the publication of old-fashioned romances was already in steady decline. Therefore, the relationship between temporal proximity to the subject matter and a more straightforward reception experience must not be overstated. Whatever benefits may have been relevant at the start of the seventeenth century, no new romances of chivalry were written in Spain after *Don Quixote*, and this followed the end of a long decline: from the publication of *Amadís de Gaula* in 1508, there was an average of one new romance published every year until 1550. From that year until the attempted invasion of England by the Armada in 1588-89 there were only 9 produced, and in the intervening period between then and the publication of the First Part of *Don Quixote* there was only one.<sup>62</sup> Whether or not this was a cause or effect of the waning popularity of the initial phase in *Don Quixote's* critical reception in England remains open to debate, but I would argue that the former is more likely.

De Bruyn is one of a number of critics to reduce the reception of *Don Quixote* during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to three artificially segregated categories

---

<sup>62</sup> Henry Thomas Litt, a lecturer in Hispanic Studies at the University of Cambridge in the early decades of the twentieth century, has catalogued these in chronological order (1920: 147).

along century lines. Koppenfels has also stated that “throughout the seventeenth and a good part of the eighteenth century, the Manchegan knight was almost exclusively considered a basically foolish and ridiculous character” (2005: 27). Whilst this statement does allow for some overlap in critical thinking between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, at the same time such a broadly generalising view totally overlooks the earlier evidence discussed to show that the shift away from a purely comic view was already underway. Canavaggio also lumps all interpretations of *Don Quixote* during the seventeenth century into the same critical basket, stating that “en Espagne, comme á l’étranger, notre chevalier est perçu comme un inadapté, un extravagant, voire un insense” (2005: 54). Not only does this statement disallow for any temporal evolution in the way *Don Quixote* was received within its English readership, it also prohibits any differentiation between its reception across different countries.<sup>63</sup> As Henitiuk has noted, the process of translating a source text into the language of foreign readers is a “fitful evolution”,<sup>64</sup> and not something so smooth or uneventful that it should be unduly minimised or compartmentalised.

Part of this classification into artificially distinct categories may well lie in contrasting views of what it is that defines a literary movement. Close has defined them as, first and foremost “clearly defined patterns of similarity in their opinions” and secondly, “both synchronic and diachronic” (1978: 5). The evidence surrounding the reception of *Don Quixote* in England, however, refutes both of these statements. The stark contrasts in critical opinion which touch upon the much-studied subject of the changing perceptions of *Don Quixote* in Britain from 1605 onwards, clearly illustrate that any changes in the way English readers viewed *Don Quixote* are far from clear-cut or easily definable. Although the reasons behind this blurring varies,<sup>65</sup> the reality is that any attempt to clearly mark where one trend in critical literary thinking ends and another begins is in most cases impossible. Furthermore, if Close’s suggestion were accepted as accurate, a literary movement by definition cannot be both diachronic and synchronic. Certainly in the case of *Don Quixote* and its reception in England, it was very much a diachronic process, one which has exerted a “continuous and regular influence” since the early 1600s into the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Ardila

---

<sup>63</sup> See also Close (2000)

<sup>64</sup> ‘The Bones of the Stuff: Translation and the Worlding of Literatures’, guest lecture given by Dr. Valerie Henitiuk at Herriott-Watt University, Edinburgh, (16<sup>th</sup> November 2011).

<sup>65</sup> For a full discussion on this topic see Scodel (1999); Grabo (2000: 697-715); Wellek (1963); Wimsatt and Brooks (1959).

2009a: 3). To reduce it to anything more simplistic would be to overlook the complexity that makes Cervantes masterpiece so unique.

This diachronicity, and the ambiguity it creates in trying to chart the evolution of this or any novel's reception over the course of several hundred years, extends beyond the seventeenth century. The compartmental view, which would categorise key changes in *Don Quixote's* reception in England into three distinct phases coinciding with the three centuries, considers the *Don Quixote* which eighteenth century readers encountered purely as a work of satire.<sup>66</sup> As noted, Close refers to the eighteenth century as the "age of satire"<sup>67</sup> and remarked that Cervantes was "set on a pedestal as a master of the genre" (1978: 11), even going so far as to suggest that admiration for Cervantes was higher in England than Spain at the time. While there is no denying that satire as a genre in its own right came to the fore in England during the eighteenth century, in relation to the effect that this had on the reception of *Don Quixote* it is only the first half, and not all of, the eighteenth century in which this bears any significant relevance.

#### 2.4 Cervantes and the readers of *Don Quixote*

The transition undertaken by *Don Quixote* in its reception among English readers over the years has been widely studied and discussed. As Burton has pointed out, "surely in the eighteenth century no author changed so dramatically before the eyes of his admirers as Cervantes did before his English readers" (1968: 15). What has not received anywhere near the same degree of critical attention is one of the most likely causes of this shift away from the comic to the identifiable, and eventually heroicised. In other words, what it was that suddenly encouraged readers to identify with the knight and therefore cease to regard him as purely mad. The little research that has been carried out on this all seems to point towards a common cause, suggesting that this shift coincides with the amount known about Cervantes and of his life.<sup>68</sup> Prior to the eighteenth century, very little was known about the man or his life and background in any great detail. Critical interest began to focus

---

<sup>66</sup> See Paulson (1967) for a fuller analysis of the satire debate.

<sup>67</sup> Close's description of the eighteenth century reflects the unanimous view of critics and scholars, as was reflected by the Tate Britain Exhibition 'Rude Britannia', 9<sup>th</sup> June-fifth September 2010. See also essays by Weinbrot (2007), and Kern (1976) for an in-depth exploration of specifically literary satire during the period.

<sup>68</sup> Parker (1956); Staves (1972); Donahue (2009a: 181-190) and Burton (1968) all touch on this issue.

on this towards the middle of the eighteenth century, and the first formally published biography in English is incorporated into Smollett's translation published in 1755.

In fact, Smollett's translation represents a major milestone in the course of *Don Quixote's* reception. This is particularly the case in relation to the fact that the newly emerging phenomenon of literary criticism, which was a recognised field in its own right by the arrival of the nineteenth century, was well underway by the second half of the eighteenth century along, with the emergence of the Romantic Movement (Ardila 2006). In comparison to previous centuries during *Don Quixote's* reception, by this point "no longer does [one] have to poke around the odd corners of English writing to discover an occasional allusion" (Knowles 1942: 279) to the author. As "the novelist who translated *Don Quixote*" (Knowles 1942: 284), Smollett was the first to enable the readers to get to know their author. He took them beyond the occasional instances within the story where Cervantes' presence as narrator is suggested, forming an image of him and almost building a form of imaginary connection to him. Close ranks among the many critics to acknowledge the parallel between the mid-eighteenth century shift from satire to Romanticism and the reader's level of acquaintance with Cervantes (1978: 11), although this view is by no means unanimous among critics. Parker argues that eighteenth-century authors and translators were too interested in aspects such as "outward form regulated by fixed precepts" in comparison to their earlier seventeenth-century counterparts, and less on the "inner significance that could be given to the literary representation of human characters and actions" (1956: 16). There are two main points to note at this stage; firstly, that the term "human characters" also includes the author; and secondly, that Parker's argument can be easily contradicted. The reason Smollett's version of *Don Quixote* was so successful, with more than thirty complete editions produced by 1839 (Hart 1988: 118), was because it offered readers something unique that none before him had provided. He let readers view the novel within the context of the author's own life and the environment around him which inspired his work.

Although Smollett's was the first biography written in English, Mayans y Siscar's Spanish biography had been commissioned by Lord Carteret over a decade earlier in 1738, in the deluxe edition for Queen Charlotte. Prior to this, there is a notable expansion in the spread of Cervantes' other works among English readers, not just *Don Quixote*. In 1632 Mabbe produced a translation of twelve of the *Novelas ejemplares*; in 1681 an anonymous translation of Cervantes' *El Celoso Extremeño*, entitled *The Jealous Husband*, appeared and

in 1687 L'Estrange also published an English version of the *Novelas ejemplares* which was followed by Pope's translation in 1694. The fact that the *Novelas ejemplares* never achieved the same acclaim or position among English readers (Randall and Boswell 2009: xviii) is irrelevant in this case; the surge in interest in Cervantes' other works aside from *Don Quixote* is enough to indicate that readers were taking more of an interest in him as an author and were keen to know more about him. Burton discusses this parallel between author and book, having stated that:

Cervantes' seventeenth- and eighteenth-century readers came to know him first in his book. As their views of Don Quixote altered, so did their picture of Cervantes, and as they found out from other sources more about the author, so their attitudes to his work changed. (1968: 1)

This quote reveals two key points to consider in any analysis of the shift in *Don Quixote's* English reception during the first half of the eighteenth century; firstly, it shows how readers' attitudes towards *Don Quixote* and its protagonist had softened, as readers became more able to identify with and relate to the knight, hand in hand with the way that they were able to understand the author himself. Secondly, Burton's comments also indicate that this desire to know more about biographical context surrounding the author in the first place, is interpolated with the recently emerged genre of literary criticism discussed earlier. In other words, it would have been impossible to level any sort of commentary on *Don Quixote* during the eighteenth century without understanding where it had come from and why. As a result of digging into the details surrounding the author's life, whether they knew it or not, readers began to form an understanding and attachment, so much so that they began to see themselves in Cervantes' novel. Ardila also cites the publication of Motteux's version as a key turning point in this shift towards identification, highlighting that after the earliest decades of the eighteenth century the reader's view of Don Quixote "se subvierte radicalmente: el lector ya no se ríe, desde la distancia, de Don Quijote, sino que pasa a identificarse con él y a ponerse en su lugar" (2006: 2-3).

### 2.5 Towards a Romantic *Don Quixote*

The process of reader identification with both the author and protagonist, which was so visible during the eighteenth century, had laid the foundations for the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* in years to come. It was not until towards the end of that century, however, that English receptions of *Don Quixote* began to close the door on the

comic and move towards a Romantic interpretation. In this the knight was admired as a hero, and his ridiculous unnecessary journeys were seen as noble quests to carry wider social messages on behalf of those without a voice.<sup>69</sup> Sarah Wood believes that it is not until “the (eighteenth) century’s end, however, readers saw in *Don Quixote* the makings of a true Romantic” (2005: 9). The use of the term “true Romantic” (my emphasis) further indicates the gradual element of the shift in *Don Quixote*’s English reception. Rather than a sudden switch triggered by the dawn of a new century, Cervantes’ readers as well as his translators had begun to see in *Don Quixote* the early signs of Romantic potential much earlier. It was not until the nineteenth century that this alteration was fully consolidated. Thus, although the highly-charted and much-discussed Romantic reception was not in full swing until the beginning of the nineteenth century,<sup>70</sup> the early signs are highly visible prior to this. Although Close regards the Romantic approach to *Don Quixote* as being completely misguided and ill-judged, he does acknowledge that eighteenth-century readers were already viewing Cervantes from a Romantic perspective. By the close of the eighteenth century, Cervantes had shaken off his earlier invisibility and was now regarded in England as a “gallant hero at Lepanto, defiant captive at Algiers, neglected and poverty-stricken genius in old age – here was material for a sentimental novel or an opera” (1978: 13).

## 2.6 Consolidation of literary criticism as a recognised phenomenon

Unlike in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, during *Don Quixote*’s nineteenth-century reception receivers of *Don Quixote* had a much greater wealth of critical resources at their disposal. In order to further understand the reasons why Cervantes’ novel was received the way it was at that time, and how this potentially motivated the strategies and decisions adopted by the three translators in the 1880s, it is therefore necessary to understand what was being said about *Don Quixote* within the field

---

<sup>69</sup> By this point *Don Quixote* had achieved extraordinary success as a canonical novel and was praised by virtually all of the best eighteenth-century novelists, including Fielding, Smollett and Sterne. Whilst the foundations laid by the early stages of the shift in *Don Quixote*’s reception had paved the way, the strength of the success of the shift in how Cervantes’ novel was received was determined by its high standing and popularity.

<sup>70</sup> For an in-depth discussion of the Romantic interpretations of *Don Quixote*, see Pawl (2009: 166-175) and also Pardo’s chapter in *Don Quijote en su periplo universal: aspectos de la recepción internacional de la novela cervantina* ed. Hans-Christian Hagendorn (2011: 363-387) in addition to those critical works already cited.

of literary criticism in the nineteenth century. The emergence of the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* in England in the second half of the eighteenth century overlaps with the beginnings of the rise to recognition of literary criticism as an academic form in its own right, which then flourished even further during the first half of the nineteenth century. This is what makes *Don Quixote's* reception during the nineteenth century unique from any of those that came before it, and it is therefore important in the context of this study to explore the relationship between how *Don Quixote* was received and how this reception was brought about through what others said about it. By understanding the factors at play when Duffield, Ormsby and Watts were producing their translations, it will help to explain any common, shared aspects of their individual translation strategies.

Jauss has broadly termed the newly available resource which had come to the fore by the start of the nineteenth century a “critical tradition and analytical vocabulary to account for new vernacular forms” (2009: 33). In other words, there was now a more organised and uniform system in place for analysing Cervantes’ novel. Although it is true that each unique phase of *Don Quixote's* reception was affected by a distinct set of social, cultural and political norms, which in turn influenced areas such as literature and the arts (Jones 1992: 497; Schmidt 2011: 50; Staves 1972: 210; Close 1978: 10-12).<sup>71</sup> None of the novel’s earlier receivers had had any concrete literary criticism to look to in the way their nineteenth-century counterparts did. Indirect literary criticism also existed, in the form of how other nineteenth-century authors responded to the reception of *Don Quixote* and allowed this to influence their work.

A major component of the parallel development between literary criticism and a more romanticised reception of *Don Quixote* in the nineteenth century were the earlier works of Rev John Bowle. Not only are these some of the first known critical works with the sole purpose of analysing *Don Quixote*, they also played a key role in ensuring the involvement of Romanticism in its reception during the nineteenth century, and thus are likely to have influenced the decisions made by Duffield, Ormsby and Watts. Bowle’s most notable works include his *Letter to Reverend Dr Percy* (1777) and his three-volume edition of *Don Quixote* (1781), one of which volumes consisted purely of critical studies, references

---

<sup>71</sup> For a fuller discussion of the influential relationship between literature and its wider environmental context, see chapters Ardila, De Bruyn, Mayo and Ardila, Colahan, Pawl and Mills in Ardila (2009a).

and indexes to an extent never seen before. Although the work of one person alone can not be credited with cementing Cervantine literary criticism's position within the field of academic studies, critics are unanimous in their view that it was Bowle who led the way. Ardila describes him as "the first serious Cervantes scholar", whose *Letter to Reverend Dr Percy* was "the first critical analysis of Cervantes' novel" (2009a: 8), as well as noting that Bowle's contribution to the field was "the founding stone of Cervantes studies" (2009a: 10) which would be built on in the decades that followed. The title of a critical chapter by Eisenberg, 'The Man Who Made *Don Quixote* A Classic: The Rev John Bowle' (1971: 39-76), is in itself a testament to the significance of Bowle's achievements; Cox calls him "the man who did so much for the reinterpretation of Cervantes' novel" (1970: 104), as well as "the first real editor of *Don Quixote*" (1970: 103), and De Bruyn hails him as "a pioneer in Cervantine scholarship" (2008: 38). Given the level of Bowle's influence on critical thinking at that time, it would be impossible to analyse *Don Quixote's* nineteenth-century reception without acknowledging the status of *Don Quixote* criticism among English readers from the final stages of the eighteenth century onwards.

Staves has noted in the context of Hazlitt's writings on *Don Quixote*, which emerged in England largely during the second and third decade of the nineteenth century, "a Romantic and Chivalric *Don Quixote* began to appear thirty to forty years earlier" (1972: 207). Not only is this relevant to this study in that it demonstrates that the way English readers received *Don Quixote* in the nineteenth century was a direct hangover from its eighteenth-century reception, this statement also illustrates just how instrumental Bowle had been in shaping this interpretation. As Staves puts it, Bowle's "attitude towards chivalry is significant in tracing the progress of the eighteenth century's *Don Quixote* from crackpot to the saint of idealism" (1972: 208). The fact that Bowle is still held in such high regard by contemporary critics nowadays, such as Boswell, is mirrored by the esteem in which he was held by readers of Cervantes' novel back in the nineteenth century. They saw in him "a fitting companion for Shakespeare, that other genius whom the English had learned to venerate" (1978: 209), and this further illustrates how central Bowle's input was in establishing not only a hunger for Cervantes' novel but also for works of literary criticism. As modern critics have acknowledged, Bowle's edition of *Don Quixote* marked a turning point in that it was the first publication to include paratexts and annotations, or in other words, "the learned apparatus of notes proper to a classic text" (Close 1978: 10) or "scholarly apparatus that reflected the latest methodology" (De Bruyn 2009: 42).

Albeit indirect criticism, the clearest examples of literary criticism already emerging towards the end of the eighteenth century were the 'other Quixote' figures, such as the female Quixote and the spiritual Quixote, which were already commonplace in late eighteenth-century imitations of Cervantes' works. By looking at these earliest forms of literary criticism around *Don Quixote*, it enables this study to track any changes in the perspective of the critical thinking over the course of the intervening decades into the nineteenth century. The significance of the 'other Quixotes' in relation to this study lies in the fact that the protagonists and their stories allowed their authors to selectively borrow features and aspects from the original Quixote character and his story, in order to convey plots carrying heavily subjective and subversive points of view. By looking at the features critics considered key at that time, this offers a basis for comparison when looking at the features retained or discarded when the three nineteenth-century translators came to adopt their own similar filtering approach later in the 1880s. Such examples include Charlotte Lennox' *The Female Quixote* (1752), whose protagonist, like Cervantes' knight, finds herself in one problematic situation after another as a result of reading an excessive amount of questionable choices of reading material.<sup>72</sup> Lennox used this as a means of parodying the prevailing trend at the time, particularly among female readers, to heavily favour sentimental romances over all other genres. In a similar vein, Richard Graves uses *The Spiritual Quixote; or the Summer's Ramble of Mr Geoffrey Wildgoose* (1773) to parody what he perceived to be the excessively naïve and misguided enthusiasm of Methodism. As Pardo has noted, such works focus on a protagonist who "with good intentions, based on a dubious idealism, he sets out to reform the world, not through practising knight-errantry, but by preaching Methodism" (2005:88).<sup>73</sup> Much like Cervantes' curative purpose in *Don Quixote*, Knowles argues that through this mockery Graves is in fact attempting to "redeem Englishmen from the folly of Methodism" (1947: 285).

This technique of utilising a quixotic novel as a means of pushing a specific literary or religious trend in or out of fashion undergoes a paradoxical U-turn during the final stages of the consolidation of literary criticism's place in academic society. An example is Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley* novels, which use the concept of a literary Quixote figure to reject

---

<sup>72</sup> For a further analysis of female Quixote figures, see Staves (1972: 193-215); Pawl ( in Ardila 2009a: 166-175); Ardila's own opening chapter in the same volume (2009a: 1-31); Ardila (2006: 103-132); and Gordon (2005: 127-142)

<sup>73</sup> For a fuller analysis of the concept of the spiritual Quixote, see Fernández-Morera & Hanke (2005: 81-106); Staves (1972: 199-200); and Hammond (in Ardila 2009a: 96-103).

the features of romance dominant at the end of the eighteenth century, including gothic horror and sentimental plots. Instead, he aims to move away from these and create more a realistic portrait of society at that time, which he sought to do through a Romantic portrayal.<sup>74</sup> Waverley's character has access to a vast library in an old manor house, just like Don Quixote. But whilst the books which Cervantes' protagonist chose to read, and goes mad as a result of, are tales of chivalry Waverley's equivalent are works of Romantic literature from all over Europe. Just like Don Quixote, Edward gradually prefers to withdraw himself from the real world around him and seek solace in his preferable and imaginary world of old, until he reaches the point where his loved ones come to question his sanity. As a result, the use of the quixotic spin-off as a means of literary criticism is in fact precisely what brought the Romantic element of *Don Quixote* to the fore once again almost two hundred years after its initial publication. Only, this time, the Romantic elements in the eyes of the protagonist are at least celebrated and not mocked. Critics<sup>75</sup> have cited Mark Twain's comments on this topic, when he reflected the following:

A curious exemplification of the power of a single book for good or harm is shown by the effects wrought by *Don Quixote* and those wrought by *Ivanhoe*. The first swept the world's admiration for this medieval chivalry silliness out of existence; and the other restored it. (D'Haen & Dhondt 2009: 248).

A consequence of the newfound availability of the formal literary criticism during the nineteenth century was that it enabled *Don Quixote* and Cervantes to have a greater impact on other authors at that time than had previously been the case. Scott, as one of the most prolific British Romantic novelists writing at the start of the nineteenth century, and who also wrote critical publications on *Don Quixote*. is just one of many examples of this link. Aside from his *Waverley Novels*, for which he is best-known, such as *Rob Roy* (1817), *Ivanhoe* (1819), as well as the four series of *Tales of My Landlord*<sup>76</sup> his relevant works also include an extensive collection of poetry. These show how Scott was inspired by Cervantes' novel and, specifically, how he chose to replicate and enhance some of *Don Quixote's* traits while discarding others. To highlight one example, while both Scott's and Cervantes' works displayed realism insofar as they reflected their society and surroundings, Cervantes was

---

<sup>74</sup> See Staves (1972: 214-215).

<sup>75</sup> See De Bruyn (2009: 48) for a discussion of these other critics.

<sup>76</sup> *The Black Dwarf* and *Old Mortality* (1816), *The Heart of Midlothian* (1818), *The Bride of Lammermoor* and *The Legend of Montrose* (1819), followed by *Count of Robert Paris* and *Castle Dangerous* (1832).

what one critic has called a “quixotic realist”, whereas Scott was more of a “historical realist” (Duckworth 1983: 68), whose heroes were unexceptional and took very little proactive action to solve the dilemmas they faced. A further contrast between the two is also the fact that neither Henry Morton, Waverley nor Frank Baldistone ever advocate or themselves initiate action beyond the boundaries of the law, no matter how justified or remedial it might have seemed to do so. Don Quixote, on the other hand, freed the criminals he encountered on their way to the gallows without a moment’s hesitation or forethought as to what the consequences of his actions might be. This presence of Cervantes’ influence in Scott’s works has been so widely studied that it does not require further illustration in this discussion; Gerli (2005), Eisenberg (1987), Ardila (2009a), and Staves (1972: 212-215) are only a handful of examples of the existing critical analysis of this influence. But Scott’s literary standing and influence on *Don Quixote’s* nineteenth-century British reception was not restricted to his role as an author. He also published widely as a literary critic, and although never writing on Cervantes directly he did do so on authors influenced by him, including Henry Fielding and Tobias Smollett. In addition, he wrote reviews of individual works influenced by *Don Quixote* published during his own lifetime, such as *Emma* and *The Pilgrim’s Progress*.

The significance of these two literary roles played simultaneously by Scott, as both author and critic, is fundamental to understanding *Don Quixote’s* nineteenth-century British reception. Scott embodies the symbiotic coexistence of the rise of literary criticism and the emergence of Romanticism in English literature, both of which played a major role in shaping how *Don Quixote’s* nineteenth-century reception was different from any of its previous stages. Williams defined Scott in terms of his critical style as a “practical rather than a theoretical critic” (1968: 2), in contrast to others who charted *Don Quixote’s* reception among English readers before him. Scott’s contemporaries also acknowledged the fundamental role he played in the English reception of *Don Quixote* during the early stages of the nineteenth century; in a review of his works in the *Quarterly Review* Lockhart commends the way in which Scott “has widened the field to an extent of which none who went before him ever dreamed (...), ennobled it by the splendours of a poetical imagination” (1826: 366), and Scott’s critical position can also be likened to that held by Coleridge, both of whom have been credited with “formulating a new approach to literature” (in Williams 1968: 11).

Thus, by the arrival of the nineteenth century, the concept of a novel was more than just the story told. This is of central importance to this study, as a novel was by now a whole package of which its story formed only a part, and readers not only identified with the protagonists but also with the author behind them. The power of the reader's relationship with the author, and how this impacted on their reception of that author's work, was extremely potent in the case of *Don Quixote* during the nineteenth century, and numerous studies conducted to date have already traced the recognition of the link between the reader being able to identify with the characters in a novel and the novel's popularity as far back as the mid-eighteenth century.<sup>77</sup> Dr Johnson's view, that "very few readers, amidst their mirth or their pity, can deny that they have admitted visions of the same kind" as Don Quixote's or Sancho's, was echoed by his contemporaries.<sup>78</sup> As the pioneer of this landmark change in what readers came to expect from a novel, one person whose role in paving the way for the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* cannot be underestimated is Tobias Smollett. Indeed, when commenting on the lack of literary criticism prior to the middle of the eighteenth century, Knowles has noted that "serious discussions, criticisms, appraisals of Cervantes' novel are non-existent in English during this time" (1942: 272). He attributes this to the poor and often volatile state of relations between Spain and England over the previous two centuries, an alternative view to those put forward by other critics as discussed earlier. But, despite the different reasons offered, the fact remains that Smollett's biography alongside his translation marks a turning point in how English readers received *Don Quixote*.

It is by looking at how other works of literature, produced during the second half of the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries, appear to drive forward a more heavily romanticised view of *Don Quixote* that in turn sets the scene for critical thinking during the later decades when the English translations were published. This is especially relevant as, although they were not published until the 1880s, work had begun on writing them nearly two decades earlier;<sup>79</sup> much closer to the time at which the works discussed

---

<sup>77</sup> See Burton (1968: 1-15); Morera & Hanke (2005); Menéndez Pelayo (1908: 193-228); Randall & Boswell (2009) among others.

<sup>78</sup> *The Rambler*, no.2 vol 24, March 1750. See also Close (1978: 12-13) and Allen (1969: 4-5) for further discussion of this trend among Johnson and his contemporaries.

<sup>79</sup> Watts states that it took him 18 years to write his translation (1888: xi), which would mean that he began working on it in 1870. On the basis that he and Duffield began working together, on what was initially intended to be a collaborative version, it is highly probable that Duffield began around the same time.

above were emerging, thus increasing the level of influence over the translations that these works were likely to have exerted. De Bruyn acknowledges this drastic change in the way Romance has been regarded throughout *Don Quixote's* existence among English readers, and recognises that the arrival of the nineteenth century brought with it a "historicised and newly favourable view of chivalry" (2009: 43). Thus, it was the emergence of literary criticism, bolstered by influences in other areas of the cultures sphere, which led to the creation of the other Quixote figures and, within this, the transition from the female to the spiritual to the literary. Other such influences can be found by bringing the Pre-Raphaelite movement, which contributed toward a semi-return to the medieval through its rejection of the concept of mechanisation, of classical compositions and elegant poses, and instead advocated a return to an excess of hand-made detail, bold colours and intricate compositions. One of the leading figures of the later stages of this movement, Edward Burne-Jones, famously began his successful career by painting *The Merciful Knight* in 1863. It retells an eleventh-century legend of Florentine knight, who showed lenience to his enemy when he had the opportunity to kill him. Paintings such as this one by Burne-Jones is significant because it adds another dimension to the process of the reader's desire to get to know their author and protagonist: they know had visual resources at their disposal to supplement those in written form. The parallel between timing of this noble, heroicised and honourable view of the knight when considered in the context of trends in literary thinking at the time is impossible to ignore.

### 2.7 The early stages of the rise of the Romantic *Don Quixote*.

The issue of reader identification with the protagonist, and how this impacts on the way they receive a novel, is extremely significant in the specific context of the Romantic approach to *Don Quixote*. It naturally causes the reader to always view the protagonist in the most sympathetic light possible, another factor of which the three translators in the nineteenth century would have needed to have been mindful. Close describes this rose-tinted view of Don Quixote's otherwise ludicrous actions as the "widespread recognition of the qualities of humanity, charity and goodness in the character of Cervantes' hero" (1978: 13). Where previous readers thought Cervantes' protagonist ridiculous or out of touch with reality, under the Romantic reception these ill-fated blunders were seen merely as misguided oversights, whose well-intended motivations outweighed any cause for guilt or

blame. For example, the incident involving Don Quixote and the servant boy Andrés illustrates how, in the eyes of Romantic readers, the protagonist never acts on any malicious impulse and yet often achieves the same effect as if he had, and the very person he tries to save invariably emerges even worse off than before.<sup>80</sup>

Don Quixote, the modern Icarus, finds his wings perpetually melting, but he rejects all advice and persists in his reckless endeavour to set the world to rights. In this respect the episode of Andrés is fundamental . . . . He [Don Quixote] settles the matter off-hand, airily decides that Andrés is to be set free, calculates his exact wages, and, brushing aside the boy's misgivings, leaves him at the mercy of his cynical employer and rides off well pleased to have begun his knight-errantry in so auspicious a fashion . . . . The anger of Don Quixote at the treatment of Andrés was legitimate, but his remedy was external, rash, hollow, and insufficient. (Bell 1965: 204)

This comparison drawn between Cervantes' protagonist in the eyes of Romantic readers and one of the great classical mythical heroes, not only displays the Romantics' nostalgic affiliation with the past, but also nods towards the influence of the sublime on *Don Quixote's* romantic reception. As the predominant factors at play during the first half of the nineteenth century, it is important to explore these in order to understand how they impacted on subsequent schools of thought about Cervantes' novel. Coleridge's writings on the sublime in the context of Don Quixote's Romantic reception, which echo almost perfectly those of Kant several decades earlier, offer a further insight into this relationship. Coleridge states that "I meet, I *find* the Beautiful - but I give, contribute or rather attribute the Sublime. No object of the Sense is sublime in itself; but only as far as I make it a symbol of some Idea."<sup>81</sup> De Bruyn also describes the sublime as the process of "making feeling rather than action the measure of greatness" (1987: 196), and not only does Coleridge underline the way the sublime encourages the reader to contemplate everything in a greater context to that in which it is apparently being presented, but he also proposes that every single object or incident can be sublime but will not appear so until the reader approaches it in such a way. In other words, the reader must be proactively inclined to look for the hidden meaning and symbolism rather than expect it to be overtly highlighted by the author. Christian Hirschfeld, a late eighteenth-century romantic thinker, echoed this view when he summed up the sublime as being mankind's ability to see his own potential in

---

<sup>80</sup> See also Bourke and Quirk (1985) for an in-depth study of this episode in particular, and its significance in relation to *Don Quixote* as a whole.

<sup>81</sup> See Shaw's (2007) examination of the Kantian influence on Coleridge for further analysis.

nature's grandness (in Mortensen 1998: 36). This aspect of Romanticism is relevant to this study as it explains why there is a variation in the degree of Romanticisation shown by the three nineteenth-century translators, or indeed as there would be between any collection of translators. It is also the one which has been most heavily criticised by anti-Romantic academics, such as Russell and Close, on the grounds that it imposes new layers of interpretation onto the novel which were potentially never intended to be there by the source-text author. Their view is typical of trends in late-twentieth century critical thinking, as evidenced by the way it was put forward even more fervently by subsequent critics: Newton has stated that "literary discourse is static and unidirectional... it goes from author to text to reader" (1995: 65), supporting Dane's argument that any other additional interpretations are merely "the product of a readers' bias and self-interest" (1991: 62).

These modern arguments must be interpreted in the context of the decades in which they were written, and the trends in critical thinking to which they conformed. Likewise, the theory of the sublime discussed above must also be considered in a nineteenth-century context, and in doing so it immediately becomes apparent why *Don Quixote* was seen during its Romantic reception as the tale of a hero, albeit a misunderstood and perpetually ill-fated one.<sup>82</sup>

Spain's contribution to the Romantic Movement in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries may explain the translation choices made by Duffield, Ormsby and Watts, all of whom had visited Spain and had some degree of familiarity with its culture. Despite what was happening in England during the early nineteenth century, chivalry was not being universally mocked in Spain and, in fact, was still largely viewed in a positive light. Scott acknowledges this in his 'Essay on Chivalry' when he remarks that "in no country of Europe had this spirit sunk so deeply and spread so wide as in Spain" (1814: 5) and, as the birthplace of *Don Quixote*, Romanticism seemed to critics in other countries to be the most natural and effective approach on which to base their reception of *Don Quixote* at that time. Scott goes on to further illustrate this later in the same essay, when he argues that Spain and Romance in literature were "particularly connected; and the associations which are formed upon perusing the immortal works of Cervantes, induce us for a long time to

---

<sup>82</sup> De Bruyn has highlighted the major differences between an entirely sublime hero and his romantic counterpart. He notes that "eighteenth-century and Romantic writers are united in rejecting the former's dual treatment of the demands of both society and the individual... The Romantic hero places himself beyond the pale of society and rejects the value of its claims upon him" (1987: 213).

believe that the country of *Don Quixote* must be the very cradle of Romantic fiction” (1814: 98). On the basis of this influence, a probable expectation is that the greater the level of first-hand experience of Spain that each of the three nineteenth-century translators had, the more romanticised their translations would be.

Although very little critical attention has been devoted to any potential explanation of this natural link between Spain’s chivalric past and the way in which this coincides so neatly with Romanticism, Saglia has suggested that it is down to the climate. According to him, Romanticism turned Spain into a country where “imagination thrived freely in the warm Mediterranean climate” (2000: 54), thus making it conducive to the more fantastic and decorative aspects of Romantic literature. This fashionable status attributed to Romantic literature in Spain was clearly mirrored in England by the turn of the nineteenth century, with the re-emergence of medieval Spanish ballads in translation and, more tellingly, with the creation of new ones from English writers, such as Coleridge and Wordsworth’s *Lyrical Ballads* (1798); William Stewart Rose and Robert Southey’s *Amadis of Gaul* (1803); and Southey’s individual translations of *Palmerin of England* (1807) and *The Chronicle of the Cid* (1808). What is significant about this literary trend, in the context of the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote*, is that the popularity of these ballads made an essential contribution to putting Spanish literature on the map in the eyes of English readers, and the growth in popularity can be deduced from the increasing length of the ballads being translated.<sup>83</sup>

It was largely as a result of this rise to fashion of chivalry and Romanticism in England at the start of the nineteenth century, that a general resurgence in scholarly interest in many aspects of Spanish literature throughout nineteenth-century England began. However, the contribution also made by the political sphere at the time must not be overlooked either. Some critics have argued that Spain was in fact to blame for diminishing the extent to which the Romantic approach was fostered.<sup>84</sup> According to them, this was the consequence of the fact that Spain was not only the birthplace of the picaresque but also the birthplace of *Don Quixote* almost two centuries earlier, thus having diverted critical attention away from the Romantic era. I would, however, argue that the opposite is in fact

---

<sup>83</sup> For a fuller analysis of this topic, see the introductory chapter of Saglia (2000).

<sup>84</sup> Close notes that, even in the earliest years of the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote*, Spain lagged behind other European countries (1978: 10-12) and even when this did get underway it was less far-reaching by comparison (1978: 43).

true. Despite Byron's famous remark in *Don Juan*, that *Don Quixote* was responsible for smiling Spain's chivalry away (Schmidt 2011: 49; Close 1978: 56; Russell 1969: 312) and in doing so marking the end for Spain's position as a dominant world power, Cervantes' novel was just as closely linked to political and military spheres under Romanticism as it ever had been during the age of chivalry. This is reflected not only within Spain but also in an English context as well. For example, in 1807 following Napoleon's invasion of Spain and the counter-invasion by British armies, Spain once more found itself the host of some of the most famous and influential battles in history, and so once again "the storied land of Romanticism was enveloped in a modern reality" (Curran 1986: 131). What this meant for receivers of *Don Quixote* in real-life terms was that to English readers during the nineteenth century, the battles, soldiers, swords and armies in Cervantes' novel were far from the outdated and long-forgotten literary trends of old, and the "idealistic heroism" of military occurrences in Spain directly inspired English writers.<sup>85</sup>

Irrespective of this scholarly rediscovery of Spain during the nineteenth century, and also the correlation between the rise of Romanticism and the emergence of literary criticism, few concrete conclusions have been drawn on *Don Quixote's* reception in England during the nineteenth century to date. This is in spite of the number of studies carried out, and Pardo has referred to this field of critical focus as an area "explorada con notable intensidad – si bien ello no siempre equivale a profundidad" (2011: 363), a criticism which could also be applied to his own study. Knowles supports this view when he states that "in the fields of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries very little scholarly research has ever been done" (1942: 277). Moreover, the lack of studies (or conclusions from such studies) produced since Knowles' comments mirrors almost perfectly the trend in critical attention paid to Cervantes' novel during the nineteenth century itself: though the earlier stages of the nineteenth century saw a greater amount of research in this area, in subsequent decades it seems to all but "desaparecer por completo" (Pardo 2011: 263). This lull is relevant to the study of the nineteenth-century English translations, because by slowing the pace of critical thinking around *Don Quixote*, and its relationship with Romanticism, it helped determine the status of critical thinking later on in the nineteenth century when the translations were

---

<sup>85</sup> In a speech to the House of Commons in 1808 Thomas Sheridan MP encouraged support to Iberian insurgents, which he saw as tantamount to safeguarding the "salvation of Europe", but in which he most notably denied claims of "prompting His Majesty's Government to engage in any rash Romantic enterprise" (in Saglia 2000: 57).

being written and then received. The pause in the evolution of *Don Quixote's* reception in England meant that in the 1880s the ties between Cervantes' novel and a romanticised reading of it were stronger than they would have been if the pace of new studies and advances in critical thinking had been maintained. Had that been the case, as with any trend in critical thinking, the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* would have run further along its course. It would therefore, by definition, have been that bit closer to reaching its conclusion and either being replaced entirely, or at least supplemented, by its successor. Were that to have happened, then how readers approached irony as a salient feature of the Romantic reading of *Don Quixote*, would also have been different at the time of the production and reception of the English translations in the 1880s. Instead, Duffield, Ormsby and Watts based their handling of irony during the translation process on the norms and trends that remained in place during the earlier decades of the nineteenth century.

The suggestion of a downturn in critical publications on *Don Quixote* during the middle of the nineteenth century is impossible to contradict: in 1813 Sismonde de Sismondi published his *De la littérature du Midi de L'Europe* which proved instrumental in establishing the presence of Romanticism in England; 1819 saw the publication of William Hazlitt's *Lectures on the English comic writers* as well as Coleridge's *Lectures 1808-1819: On Literature*; in 1820 Marchena's *Lecciones de filosofía moral y elocuencia* produced what is widely considered to be the first completely Romantic portrayal of *Don Quixote* (Close 1978: 48); in 1822 Lockhart published his famous preface to the re-edition of Motteux's translation from the previous century; and in 1837 Henry Hallam's *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Centuries* was also published. This list is by no means exhaustive; in fact, the works cited here represent merely a handful of the studies and translations of Cervantes' novel at the time. In contrast, despite the fact that "scholarly analysis soared in England during the nineteenth century" (Ardila 2009a: 19), the third quarter of it appeared to pay much less attention to *Don Quixote* and certainly produced considerably fewer works of *Quixote* literary criticism than the neighbouring periods. Aside from Nicolás Díaz de Benjumea's *La verdad sobre el Quixote* (1878), in comparison to the earlier flourishes during the early nineteenth century very little stands out as significant in the decades immediately following the consolidation of Romanticism's place in England during the 1830s and 1840s.

The most plausible explanation for this lull is that it was the calm before the Romantic 'storm' initiated by the publication of Duffield's, Ormsby's and Watts'

translations. During those decades when critical production was beginning to tail off in England, the reason for this was because Romanticism was still in the final stages of making its way over from Germany, decades after the earliest signs of its arrival had begun to emerge. This emergence during those latter stages of the eighteenth century resulted largely from the fact that, although Romanticism did not reach its peak for several decades to come, by the middle of that century readers had already “begun to forget what satire was attacking” (Burton 1968: 9). In a recently-published study of intellectuals in Britain and Germany and how they studied *Don Quixote* as a novel, Schmidt covers two key topics. Firstly, she charts the instrumental role of Friedrich Schlegel, whom she presents as a pioneer of German Romanticism and of establishing the movement among English readers; and secondly, she touches upon the role of irony and how this fitted into the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote*. But before an informed analysis of *Don Quixote* under English Romanticism can be carried out, and how it later manifested in the three nineteenth-century translations, it is first of all important to look at what led to this movement in literature in England at that time.

As Schmidt notes, Schlegel regarded irony as “part of an aesthetics of the absolute” (2011: 47), alongside humour, dialogue and tragicomedy; unlike Hegel, who saw it as “nothing more than a superior sneer” (ibid). In other words, for Schlegel a work of literature could not be complete in its representation of real life without the presence of irony, especially Romantic irony. Schlegel justifies Romantic irony’s position on this list of essential criteria on the basis of its self-reflexive possibilities, a concept that was central to the way in which German Romantic thinkers argued that any novel should be approached. This self-reflexive nature, facilitated by the presence of Romantic irony, is three-fold and is defined as the way in which the novel “turns the ironic eye not only on the content of the art, but also on the process of creating art, and the limitations and foibles of the artist himself” (ibid.). The reader is therefore both the agent of irony, as he is the beholder of the ironic eye, as well as the subject of the same irony, because he sees himself in the character of Cervantes’ knight. The other central vein of German Romantic thinking connected to this theme of critical self-reflexivity is the notion that absolute knowledge is impossible, but the persistent and permanent quest for it is essential. Irony, according to the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote*, is therefore fundamental because it “puts us on the trail of the absolute” (Millán-Zaibert 2008:173) and in doing so links the possible with the impossible. Much like Cervantes’ knight and protagonist in his journeys, the reader is never likely to

find the precise answers they are searching for in what is said in the novel, either explicitly by the characters themselves or more imperceptibly by the author. And yet, the Romantic reader will nevertheless continue to read deep into the various levels of everything that is said in search of that hidden meaning. This way in which a Romantic reader will employ irony in their interpretation of a piece of literature is therefore a vital part of any novel or translation, as it provides the reader with a choice of frames or backgrounds for “reflection on representation and knowledge” (Schmidt 2011: 47), or, a vehicle for interpreting a comment, statement or description in a wide variety of ways and attributing a number of different meanings to it.

Although Friedrich Schlegel is by no means the only German Romantic philosopher to study *Don Quixote*, nor is he the only significant or noteworthy one, he is heralded by critics as the leading figure in the German Romantic movement. He is also regarded as one of the key players responsible for bringing this movement to England.<sup>86</sup> By exploring his thinking and its impact, it therefore makes it easier to understand the exact nature of Romanticism in England at the time of the reception of the three nineteenth-century translations, and why *Don Quixote* as a novel engaged with the Movement in the way that it did. In emphasising the influence and importance of Schlegel’s work, Schmidt has gone as far as to describe Romanticism as the former’s “conceptual diamond” (2011: 72), and as a result the reception of his philosophy is “as worthy of study as the reception of Cervantes’ masterpiece itself” (2011: 48). Close also comments on the way in which German Romantic thinkers completely transformed the interpretation handed down to them by eighteenth-century neo-classicists, and how Schlegel was a key figure in this transformation (1978: 29), a role which was also acknowledged as “prominent” by De Bruyn (2009: 44). If Schlegel were such a pioneering and representative figure in German Romanticism and its reception of *Don Quixote*, then to study his writings would thus provide an accurate and representative picture of the Movement and its relationship with this novel. An equivalent study involving additional key figures, like Schelling’s or Hegel’s, although arguably more comprehensive, would require far more time and space than this thesis will allow. Instead, it is enough to consider Schlegel’s view as a representative, cross-sectional slice of the subject.

---

<sup>86</sup> In addition to Schmidt and De Bruyn, see also the recent publication by Elizabeth Millán-Zaibert (2012: 1-3).

In his famous notebooks, Schlegel observed that the ultimate, total or complete novel would be one that encompassed not only irony but also the other three components which formed the 'absolute' discussed above, and it is therefore unsurprising that he viewed *Don Quixote* as the first novel to fulfil such criteria. On one hand, *Don Quixote* offers a negative portrayal of the sentimental and fantastic, through the protagonist's madness and delusions, and the farcical comedy scenes which this brings about. Through the knight's outdated fantasies and his inability to perceive accurately what is happening in front of him in the correct context of the era in which he lives, the fact that the genre of the chivalric Romance is being mocked and parodied has been so greatly studied that it is by now axiomatic. On the other hand, there also simultaneously occurs a positive development of the key critical and philosophical characteristics of the novel, evidenced primarily through the character evolution undergone by both Sancho Panza and Don Quixote between the end of Part I and Don Quixote's death at the end of Part II.

Schlegel went on to argue that literature, especially the novel, can perform critical and philosophical enquiry normally only attributed to non-fictional forms of discourse, a feature that Bowie has dubbed "transcendental literature" (1996: 75). There is no doubt that this is true of *Don Quixote*. On the immediate and obvious level, the ridiculous escapades in which Cervantes' knight and his squire find themselves embroiled are nothing more than a source of entertainment and diversion. For example, in the 14<sup>th</sup> chapter of Part II, Don Quixote manages to defeat the Knight of the Mirrors in a duel, for the sole reason that he paused to help Sancho Panza up into the tree where he had fled after waking up and being startled by the sight of the Squire of the Wood's nose. This slapstick and hilarious scene appears to be nothing more than just that – a source of comedy and light entertainment where the reader laughs at the characters' sloppy organisation and execution of the duel. However, once Romantic irony is brought into play, a whole new meaning becomes visible in this scene: the sudden transition from the Knight of the Wood to the Knight of the Mirrors represents a questioning of values and norms earlier taken for granted as being true, one which was not present before this new context was overlaid. This not only coincides perfectly with one of the main driving forces behind Schlegel's Romantic thinking – the questioning, if not quite the rejection, of earlier Enlightenment thinking whose truths had until now been accepted without challenge – but it also reflects the fact that irony "defines both the novel and the stance of the modern thinker" (2011: 72). Thus, during the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote*, thanks to irony the reader enjoys

a greater degree of individual flexibility in how they may choose to interpret what they read: that which is said explicitly, or that which is inferred or often even simply suggested underneath. Schlegel termed this particular aspect of Romantic irony ‘Socratic irony’, in other words, the speech and the counter-speech, and in particular he describes this “Socratic dialogue of modernity” as being the difference between worldly, life-wisdom versus academic learning from books and that traditionally ascribed to social status and economic privilege.<sup>87</sup>

Aside from the purpose and significance of irony detailed in Schlegel’s writings, another issue which deeply affected Romantic thinking in relation to *Don Quixote*, and is therefore in need of further discussion in this study, is the treatment of mental illness during the early years of the nineteenth century. This was when Schlegel and his peers, such as Tieck, Novalis and Friedrich’s brother August Wilhelm Schlegel, were doing the majority of their writing. It is heavily documented, both by hispanists studying the subject of madness in *Don Quixote* as well as medical academics, that from 1790 to 1820 debates on this subject raged among thinkers from a range of disciplines.<sup>88</sup> King George III’s well-documented battle with mental illness, later thought to have been porphyria, attracted an enormous amount of attention nationwide and is no doubt just one of the reasons why Schmidt has argued that early Romantic thinkers “read *Don Quixote* in an age marked by major social and institutional changes” (2011: 51). As has already been discussed here, the wider social and political environment which surrounds any given generation of readers of any novel has a resounding effect on their reception of it, and society’s view of mental illness during the early stages of the nineteenth century provides yet another example. As the general view of mental illness among these readers of *Don Quixote* gradually began to shift away from the simplistic and all-encompassing term ‘madness’, towards something more diverse and complex, so too did the readers’ view of Don Quixote’s own madness shift. He was still as ‘mad’ during his Romantic reception as he had been 200 years earlier,

---

<sup>87</sup> This principle of simultaneously coexisting multiplicity of meanings in any given instance of *Don Quixote* is summed up perfectly in the popular *Lyceum Fragment* (1797: PF 13), in the assertion that “everything should be playful and serious, guilelessly open and deeply hidden (...) the union of *savoir vivre* and the scientific spirit (...) the conjunction of a perfectly instinctive and perfectly conscious philosophy”. Close continues this discussion further when he discusses just what it was about *Don Quixote* that made it so appealing to Romantic thinkers (1978: 32-34).

<sup>88</sup> For a general overview of the changing perceptions on mental health from the second half of the eighteenth century onwards, see Thomas Bewley’s article entitled ‘Madness to Mental Illness’ (2008).

when his story was seen as nothing more than comedy and buffoonery. However, for Romantic readers this madness was viewed as something more intricate and was less worthy of scorn and derision, a vehicle for an alternative perspective and purpose that they now began to realise that Cervantes' novel carried.

In his highly influential *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant distinguishes between *wahnsinn* and *wahnwitz*. The former represents the presence of normal faculties, but which have been filled and overrun with delusions; the latter refers to a consistent failure in proper judgement due to a lack of necessary faculties. The differentiation between the two is very important in understanding the more sympathetic view of Cervantes' knight held by nineteenth-century readers, in comparison to their earlier counterparts. An everyday person or reader can relate to a character who suffers a lapse, or short series of lapses, in sensible judgement from time to time. There remains hope that they can regain these faculties in due course, as *Don Quixote* ultimately goes on to do as the novel progresses.

Beyond the scope of individual readers, Kant's theory reflects the fact that there was now emerging a more subjective and tolerant view of madness in broader nineteenth-century society, one potentially less critical and ridiculing of the individual concerned. Romantic receivers of *Don Quixote* therefore undoubtedly viewed his madness in a more sympathetic light than earlier readers had during previous centuries, and this in turn contributes to the explanation of Romantic tendencies to dwell less on the protagonist's ridiculous and comical aspects, and instead focus on his more noble and heroic qualities.<sup>89</sup> Mayo and Ardila, whilst recognising the outdated and therefore ridiculous resurrection of life in chivalric Romances by Don Quixote, at the same time acknowledge that this simultaneously enables him to offer himself to Romantic readers as a "truly heroic defender of worthy chivalric principles and ideals" (2009: 56). Colahan comments on the "Romantic and existentialist interpretations of the mad *hidalgo*, in which he is essentially heroic" in comparison to the preceding reception put forward by Shelton's version (2009: 62), and later sums up the madness and hilarity surrounding both protagonists' assumption of false identities while at the Duke and Duchess' palace as being a representative cross-sectional view of their roles throughout the novel: "While ultimately thwarted in their heroic and administrative endeavours, respectively, they maintain their dignity, and, if a bit paradoxically, their centrality in the comprehensive scheme" (2009: 162). In his brief

---

<sup>89</sup> For a further analysis of Kant's theories, see Guyer (2010) and Woodard (2011: 3-13).

commentary on Duffield's translation, one of the very few analyses of the first of the three nineteenth-century translations produced, Pardo criticises Duffield's overreaction against the burlesque versions which had preceded his, and how in doing so he has overemphasised the knight's chaste, heroic and noble qualities (2011: 321). Auden has also studied the subject of the hero in relation to *Don Quixote* in depth and has come up with a description based on two criteria, that a hero must be both public and interesting. According to this alternative judgement, Don Quixote is the quintessential hero: he is not only "exceptional, even unique" but he is also "completely manifest to the reader, even if they remain hidden from the hero himself, deducible if not directly stated" (2001: 73). Although written over a hundred years after the early decades of the nineteenth century, Auden's hero model further establishes why *Don Quixote* was seen in a more heroic light than in pre-Romantic times.

The length of time that had passed since the last publication of an English translation of *Don Quixote* prior to the 1880s, and the quick succession in which Duffield's, Ormsby's and Watts' were published, requires further examination in its own right. The most likely explanation can be found in other areas of the cultural and literary sphere in the nineteenth century. In particular, the position of not only *Don Quixote's*, but also Spain's, presence in the visual arts in Britain. Sir William Stirling-Maxwell's *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (1848) and Richard Ford's *Handbook for Travellers in Spain* (1845) provided the first noteworthy scholarly treatment of Spanish art from an English perspective, and this stimulated a growing interest in Spanish art among British society from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards. Megías' analysis of the iconographic legacy of the seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century versions of *Don Quixote* further explores this relationship between visual art and trends in literary reception. By examining several thousand images using his own technique of "iconographic program" (Schmidt 2009: 237), Megías enables readers and critics to draw parallels in the portrayal of certain episodes of *Don Quixote* throughout various stages in its reception, as well as illustrating the increased presence of *Don Quixote* in art during the second half of the nineteenth century. It was therefore via the visual arts that a resurgence of *Don Quixote's* presence in its written form came back to life. As the first new translations published in England in over a century, those written by Duffield, Ormsby and Watts are a reflection of the revival, particularly Duffield's, as the first of the three. As a result of them leading the way in the reappearance of *Don Quixote* in English literature during the second half of the nineteenth century, how irony

was exhibited in them is directly linked to how Cervantes' novel had been portrayed in the visual arts.

Thus, looking at *Don Quixote's* role in the visual arts offers clarification and broadened critical understanding of its relationship with nineteenth-century readers and critics. Nevertheless, it often remains difficult to distinguish one critical line of thought from another among those who were writing on its reception among English readers during the nineteenth century. In the same way that it is all but impossible to define chronological cut-off points in terms of *Don Quixote's* reception, the same can also be said for the task of attributing a line of thinking to just one nineteenth-century thinker. Ambiguous though these distinctions may be, it is necessary to look at what the earlier nineteenth-century critics had said about Don Quixote, particularly in the context of Romanticism, as these would have been the critics who later influenced Duffield, Ormsby and Watts. The reason for this blurring is the link between the social and professional spheres in which the majority of literary critics moved; for example, Lockhart and Scott were relatives, and Coleridge and Wordsworth regularly worked together, having published their *Lyrical Ballads* in 1798 which was a major short-term trigger of the Romantic Movement in Britain. The same pair later went on to form two thirds of the Lake Poets trio, remaining firm friends until they fell out over Coleridge's opium dependency in 1810. As Paulin notes, it is also well known that Coleridge and Hazlitt were lifelong acquaintances, if not necessarily always friends, after 1804 when their political views began to diverge.<sup>90</sup> Even after this point, Hazlitt referred to Coleridge in his lecture 'On The Living Poets' as "the only person I ever knew who answered to the idea of a man of genius" (in Lapp 1999: 160) and goes on to uphold him as the man to whom he owed his entire career. Identifying exactly which critical opinion originated from whom is therefore problematic; as is the task of trusting that any clashes in critical thinking remain distinct from any personal or intellectual differences within their relationships with each other. It is thus necessary to look at both critics' contributions to the nineteenth-century field in conjunction with one another.

Angela Esterhammer (2000) explores the mechanisms behind Coleridge's critical approach as one of the most staunchly Romantic receivers of *Don Quixote*, based on the premise of a two-stage process during the conceptualisation of reality. For Coleridge, the first stage, 'understanding', occurs when intuitions are linked in the individual's own mind

---

<sup>90</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2004/apr/10/featuresreviews.guardianreview13> (accessed 13<sup>th</sup> May 2016).

and this then leads to the second stage, 'reason'. At this point the intuitions upon which the first stage of the process is based are placed in a "real, responsive, occasion-bound context" (2000: 62), and only then has the situation or scenario been fully received and interpreted by the individual concerned. This is very much relevant to the use of irony in translation in that the primary mental act – what is said – is what joins the subject and the predicate and this creates the possible concept – what is meant. In a non-ironic situation, this would coincide with the real existence of that concept, of what is said, but in a situation where irony is employed by the author there would be a disparity between these two. In such a situation, it would fall to the reader to determine the intended meaning on the basis of their own interpretation. Coleridge therefore belonged to the view of irony as subjective and meaning different things to different people. If the concepts formed by the primary mental act do not exist in the reader's own external world, they can still exist either in dreams or in fiction, and are therefore nevertheless 'real' in the mind of the reader.<sup>91</sup> This view has been supported by modern critics, who offer an explanation of why irony represented to different things to different readers across the centuries. Linder, for example, has differentiated between the two fundamental aspects of successfully reproducing irony in a target text; the first is to recognise the "propositional content" intended by the source text author, and the second is to tailor the clues effectively in order that they trigger the appropriate reaction in the target reader (2010: 127).

On this basis, Coleridge's critical approach states that wit is created when there is no logical unity or successful progression from the first stage in the conceptualisation process to the second. In relation to *Don Quixote* in particular, Coleridge's most notable comments are found in his highly popular lecture, given in 1818, in which he compares Cervantes to Shakespeare. By drawing a comparative analysis of the physiognomies of the two men, Coleridge reinvents them as embodying metaphors of their own respective national identities. Spain's is regarded as "acute", while England's is more "reflective", and it is noted by Coleridge's nephew that his uncle regarded *Don Quixote* as both "the master work of Miguel de Cervantes and of his country's genius" (1849: 56-58).

---

<sup>91</sup> This view is still shared by many modern critics today, who agree that "meaning does not inhere in the text itself, but is a function of the particular relationship that particular readers establish with it, the experience they bring to it, the codes to which they refer it, and the questions they ask it to answer" (Johnson 1990: 103).

Hazlitt also held *Don Quixote* up as a masterpiece and, to some extent, a reflection of national identity and issues of the day, but to a much lesser degree than Coleridge. The area of divergence between the two is in fact much greater than is often acknowledged, despite there being an undeniable degree of overlap. This was due to the influence of Coleridge on the younger Hazlitt, as well as the esteem in which Hazlitt subsequently regarded Coleridge in spite of their tumultuous friendship. Coleridge openly acknowledges Hazlitt's contempt for him in the 1836 version of his *Lectures* when he laments that his "hatred of me is in such an inverse ratio to my zealous kindness towards him" (H N Coleridge 1836: 343). However, to take this statement at face value would in fact give an inaccurate portrayal of the state of affairs between the two. The first indication of this comes from the general consensus of critical opinion that Coleridge's "faulty memory was well-known" (Schneider 1933: 91), and that he was crippled by insecurities in his writings and dogged by an incessant need for validation and approbation from his readers and peers.<sup>92</sup> In fact, despite their differences there is clear evidence to suggest that Hazlitt in fact held Coleridge in extremely high esteem as a literary critic, if not always as a friend. On a visit to Coleridge, during which the pair discussed Hazlitt's view that likeness is more than the mere association of ideas, a view which Coleridge recognised and took on board, Hazlitt noted that this conversation was witnessed by John Chester. This was a great relief to him, as he was himself "astonished that I could suggest anything to Coleridge that he did not already know" (Schneider 1933: 87). Whether this statement should be taken at face value as an example of high praise of Coleridge, or a cynical slight by Hazlitt on what he saw as Coleridge's arrogance, is impossible to determine but it at least suggests that there was some degree of mutual respect and admiration between the two.

Schneider sums up the nature of the relationship between the two nineteenth-century critics perfectly, with the statement that Coleridge was "both a stimulus and a challenge to the younger man" (1933: 93). The basis for this challenge lies in the fact that Hazlitt's critical approach was based much more heavily in the roots of Realism, and he saw much less of a link between *Don Quixote* and any sense of national identity. On one hand, it could therefore be argued that this technically makes Hazlitt less Romantic in his critical viewpoint than Coleridge, and therein less prone to advocating a heavy use of irony. On the other hand, it is also true that a huge part of Hazlitt's ideas were based on nature, in

---

<sup>92</sup> For a full discussion of this, see Esterhammer's article (2000: 56-62); and the third chapter of Schneider's analysis of the application of Hazlitt's aesthetic theory to literature (1933: 84-162).

particular the importance he placed on art's duty to imitate it. Hazlitt's literary criticism was essentially a reinvention of eighteenth-century ideas, one where reason and rationality were still very much alive, but emotions and sentiment took precedence, echoing Hume's earlier view that reason should exist only as the slave of passions (Potkay 2000: 86). Hazlitt accepted old formulas but injected new meaning into them, whether consciously or not. This shift is simply a reflection of the times in which he lived and formed his critical views. Schneider's analysis of the application of his literary theory attributes the way in which he both maintained, and yet simultaneously softened, the traditional principles of Realism. For Hazlitt it was a response to "a more serious world, a world which showed the face of mere suffering and which demanded more sympathy than the old one" (1933: 93). To argue that Hazlitt did not support the Romantic approach to literature would therefore be inaccurate, and the relevance of determining where both he and Coleridge stood on the spectrum of Romanticism lies in the fact that their thinking helped shape the views of those who received the three translations of *Don Quixote* published in the 1880s. Given that their writings very much promoted the need for a Romantic approach to *Don Quixote*, to which irony was inextricably linked, it further highlights the importance of the role played by irony and the need to study it in more detail than has been done to date.

Although Hazlitt's critical approach to Romanticism in general terms varies greatly from Coleridge's, in relation to *Don Quixote* their views are very much aligned. In particular, Hazlitt shared the latter's view that reality means different things to different readers. In his essay 'On Poetry in General' Hazlitt remarks that imagination naturally supersedes reason because it is "more true and natural, if it conveys the impression which the object under the influence of passion makes on the mind" (in Harmon 2005: 316). This mirrors Coleridge's argument that something only has to exist in the mind of the reader for them to legitimately call it real and so irony is not only subjective, but is made possible in the first place because of imagination. Hazlitt also echoes Coleridge's comments, that wit is caused when the first and second stages of the conceptualisation process fail to link up, arguing that *Don Quixote* evokes laughter because the execution of meaning is "discontinuous" (Schneider 1933: 140). Hazlitt summarises this view with the metaphor that we need only "the merest peg or loop to hang our idle fancies on and rejoice in the mere sense of power we get from making kings of mere men and gods of sticks and stones" (1931: XII, 242). Within his analysis of wit he identifies three types: words, things and senses or observations. Although he acknowledges that it is often difficult to extrapolate one from

another, Hazlitt further identifies irony as a species of wit “which owes its effect to the contrast between the appearance and the reality” (1931: VII, 10), subjective in that it relies on each reader’s own cultural, historical or social background to carry out what Schneider has termed “essentially a matter of detection and exposure” and thus find their own ironies within the text.<sup>93</sup>

Within this Hazlitt specifically highlights the importance of keeping within character as a key example of how this contrast might be created. In *Don Quixote*, the two principal character roles become increasingly blurred from their original categories as the novel progresses. Sancho, for example, gains a degree of wisdom and insight beyond what would typically have been expected by early readers,<sup>94</sup> especially Cervantes’ contemporaries, whereas Don Quixote undergoes a startling parallel character evolution which culminates in a humbling recognition of his inadequacies and faults on his deathbed. In Hazlitt’s eyes, this represented comedy perfectly moulded into the form of art, and it sits perfectly in keeping with the view that what existed before should not be removed or destroyed but rather built on and adapted to reflect the current situation. A further example is what can be inferred from Hazlitt’s comments and applied to his views of chivalry in literature, especially when placed in the context of his approach to literature in general. His critical approach centres around the fact that it is impossible to revive the old spirit of chivalry without reviving the way society was constructed, and the way the world was at that time. Similarly, Hazlitt recognises that it is also impossible to approach any historical novel without instinctively imposing our own associations and preconceptions based on our own experiences. Therefore, later readers of *Don Quixote* can never expect to fully understand or appreciate the true extent and significance of chivalry, because too much time has passed and with each subsequent generation of readers this becomes even more pronounced. Instead, literature dealing with chivalry can simply aim to “add the last polish and fine finish” (1931: XX, 203).

---

<sup>93</sup> Cf. the earlier discussion about the importance of subjectivity on pages 8-9 of this introduction.

<sup>94</sup> For example, he demonstrates an awareness of socially acceptable behaviour among polite company, pointing out that his head is packed full of wise proverbs “mas yo tendré en cuenta que de aquí adelante de decir los que convengan a la gravedad de mi cargo, que en casa llena presto se guise la cena, y quien destaja no baraja, y a buen salvo está el que repica y el dar y el tener seso ha menester” (II, 836); see also Close (1973b: 344-357).

## 2.8 A mid-century Dry Spell in the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* among English readers

Similarly to the early stages of the seventeenth century, an additional factor which contributed to the surge of interest in *Don Quixote* and its flourishing Romantic portrayal during the early stages of the nineteenth century was the popularity of the theatrical adaptations. Given the marked slump in the number of written commentaries or analyses of Cervantes' novel produced during the middle of the that century, the importance of looking to the theatrical adaptations as the predominant means of explaining how *Don Quixote* was received during that time increases. Although there remain only seven extant stage versions of *Don Quixote* produced between 1694-1916 (Ardila 2009e: 211), two of these appeared during the 1830s: George Almar's *Don Quixote; or, The knight of the woeful countenance* in 1833, and Harriet Stewart's *Don Quixote; or, The Knight of La Mancha* in 1834. For one thing, this flurry demonstrates the widening reception of *Don Quixote* and its increased availability to the theatre-going masses during the early decades of the nineteenth century. Moreover, in addition to the fact that two of the seven appear at this point, the fact they were produced within such a short space of time of each other, during even the pre-Victorian decades, demonstrates the continuation of the high level of interest in *Don Quixote* in England left over from the eighteenth century. However, during the whole of the second half of the nineteenth century only two notable theatrical adaptations continued their legacy; George E Morrison's *Alonso Quixano, otherwise Don Quixote* (1895) and W G W Wills' *Don Quixote: in One Act* (1895).<sup>95</sup> As will be discussed in the following section in this chapter, unlike the trend during the first half of the nineteenth century, this sharp downturn in the number of stage productions or adaptations which dogged the middle of the century is paralleled by the number of literary versions or translations. Given that at that time the tendency was to publish literary criticism as a paratext within the translation, rather than as a standalone volume,<sup>96</sup> the decline in the number of versions

---

<sup>95</sup> It is nevertheless probable that there were other unsurviving adaptations produced as well, such as that thought to have been written by John Tenniel, published in London around 1895, though there is no known surviving record of this.

<sup>96</sup> The three nineteenth-century translations analysed in this study, for example, each contain lengthy paratexts in the form of translator's notes, prefaces and brief summaries of those translations which preceded theirs. Watts even devotes an entire volume of his five-volume translation to critical paratexts.

produced also had a direct knock-on effect on the amount of *Quixote* criticism around the middle of the century.

Instead, the way *Don Quixote* influenced other authors at the time serves to indicate the force of the influence that this novel exerted within the field of literary criticism during the second half of the nineteenth century. As before, by studying the work of those other authors' allusions to *Don Quixote*, it creates a continuing picture of how Cervantes' novel was received during those years. Although this this bears some parallel the similar parallel to the seventeenth century, when theatrical adaptations and indirect allusions from other works was so important, the difference here is the portrayal being created is the complete opposite of its earlier counterpart. The newer, pessimistic and almost martyr-like version of Don Quixote which, according to Romantics, forms a fundamental part of *Don Quixote's* identity, appealed to a range of authors who read Cervantes' works including Dostoyevsky, Wordsworth and Byron. Dostoyevsky's *The Gambler* (1866) is replete with examples of a protagonist who is well-intentioned but perpetually doomed to failure in his quest to do the right thing and therefore win the affections of the woman he loves: Alexei tries and consistently fails to win Polina's love, and fails to see through the fact that she is using him to pay off her father's debts. He insults the Baron and Baroness whom he and Polina encounter whilst out walking, which ultimately leads to him getting fired, and she then rejects him once more for Mr Astley after he has won enough money by playing roulette to pay off all of her gambling debts instead. The resounding influence of *Don Quixote* is undeniably evident here; a game of roulette to Alexei is an adventure on horseback for the Spanish knight. Pardo sees the same well-meant but always hopeless idealism in Dostoyevsky's Alexei as in Cervantes' Don Quixote, and he even goes as far as paraphrasing the term 'quixotism' as a wider, more general sense of "idealismo inadecuado, alienado, inefectivo" (2011: 371) not necessarily specific to Cervantes' novel.

### 2.9 Towards a definition of a Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote*

Defining a timescale for the Romantic Movement in literature in England is of fundamental importance to this study, because critical consensus to date has tended to confine it to the first half of the nineteenth century, having put down its early roots towards the end of the 18<sup>th</sup>. This coincides with the fact that at its foundations lay a

reaction, triggered by the Industrial Revolution, against the political and social dominance of the aristocracy, and aspects of Enlightenment thinking such as the reduction of nature to scientific rationalisation.<sup>97</sup> On that basis, critics usually regard Romanticism's heyday in Europe as the period 1800-1840.<sup>98</sup> Whether or not this timescale is accurate is key, because it affects whether or not the translators in the 1880s would have been more or less inclined to make irony, particularly Romantic irony, a salient feature in their translations.

The desire to escape from the harsh realities of everyday life among the urban population during the Industrial Revolution<sup>99</sup> created a demand for literature which allowed readers to forget about the world around them and lose themselves in the novels they read. Nostalgic, old-fashioned and unrealistic tales and their heroes were what satisfied these demands, and this explains why the nineteenth-century reception of *Don Quixote* is characterised by the view of its protagonist as a noble and admirable hero. This becomes increasingly evident when considered in the context of everyday life in Britain at that time, for example, modes of travel. The opening of the first public locomotive-hauled railway in 1825 revolutionised the number of people who could travel all over the country; the emergence of canal waterways meant freight and goods could move between British cities more freely and speedily than ever before; and the first underground railway in 1863 between Paddington and Farringdon marked the birth of what would go on to become the London Underground, a system which would offer ordinary people more accessible and efficient transport than ever seen. For readers of *Don Quixote* living in that society, it was now more difficult than ever to relate to the knight's slow, puny Rocinante or the carriages of actors being manually carried by servants along dusty country roads. In essence, the modernisation brought about by the industrial changes during the nineteenth century helped make Cervantes' novel seem further removed from what readers could relate to than ever before.

---

<sup>97</sup> See Wallace (2009) for further exploration of the relationship between the two movements.

<sup>98</sup> Some of the many examples include Margaret Drabble, who defines the movement in literature as falling "roughly between 1770 and 1848" (1985: 842), and when summarising the key works of literature published in Britain during the Romantic period Simpson and Jones list the *Lyrical Ballads* (1798) and *Vanity Fair*, *Jane Eyre* and *Wuthering Heights* (all 1847) as the last (2013: 130).

<sup>99</sup> Martin J Wiener's study explores the ups and down of life for ordinary British people during the Industrial Revolution in detail in his book *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*. In particular, he notes that the "countryside of the mind is everything Industrial society was not – ancient, slow-moving, stable, cosy and spiritual" (2004: 6), suggesting that these were the aspects and features that those looking to escape from the realities of urban living looked for in their literature.

Given the key characteristics of Romanticism as discussed, and taking the above timeframe to be correct, it is no surprise that *Don Quixote* flourished so much under Romanticism's alleged heyday. The first obvious common ground between the two lies in the fact that the Movement actually takes its name from medieval romances of chivalry<sup>100</sup> and it is therefore unsurprising that Romantic readers during the early decades of the nineteenth century so strongly welcomed a novel replete with things like "a knight, a distressed damsel, and a dragon used to conjure up the time pictorially",<sup>101</sup> even if these are all in Don Quixote's head. Another wider element of Romanticism, the promotion of national identity including folk customs and traditions, is embodied not only in Don Quixote's and Sancho's characters but also in all the other characters they encounter on their journeys who paint a picture for the foreign reader of life in Spain at that time. The journeys themselves, including the physical surroundings and descriptions of landscapes through which Don Quixote roams on his adventures, resonate with the important role played by aesthetics, nature and landscape in Romanticism. In contrast to their Enlightenment predecessors, Romantics favoured the imagination, intuition, the exotic and unknown over the falsifiable, rational and familiar. Some critics even go as far as to suggest that, so strong was Romanticism's counter-reaction against all things related to the Enlightenment, that it in fact resulted in a form of "revived medievalism" (Agrawal 1990: 1), in response to the sprawling, noisy, dirty and overcrowded cities now dominating British landscape both economically and physically.

When analysing the status of *Don Quixote* under Romanticism during the early stages of the nineteenth century, I would argue that two clear sub-divisions emerge; firstly, the period from the turn of the century until 1820, when Romanticism was undoubtedly on its way to the forefront of critical popularity despite some elements of the earlier comic reception still lingering. The second period covers approximately 1820-1835, when an almost complete U-turn in critical thinking occurred on nearly all traces of the comic reception. De Bruyn's is one of the most detailed and thorough studies of this transition of the completely Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* from its tentatively Romantic late eighteenth-century beginnings onwards. Although he does not mention specific years along

---

<sup>100</sup>

[http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed\\_in\\_frame=0&search=Romanticism&searchmode=none](http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=Romanticism&searchmode=none)

<sup>101</sup> For a fuller discussion of this topic, see C S Lewis (1964: 9).

which to divide and categorise the four decades marking Romanticism's English heyday, he notes that during the earliest stages of the nineteenth century it would have been premature to say that the reception *Don Quixote* met was that of fully-fledged Romanticism. Rather, it was one of "increasingly sentimental actualisation" (2009: 41), which continued to build on eighteenth-century foundations. At that stage, critics and readers were not yet ready to sever all ties and commit to embracing Romanticism at the expense of all other schools of interpretation surrounding *Don Quixote*. However, this "pragmatic refusal to jettison the comic" (2009: 46) should not be mistaken for a foreshadowing of the multifaceted and hybrid reception of *Don Quixote* to come in the final stages of the nineteenth century. On the contrary, with every new translation or work inspired by Cervantes' novel during these first two decades Romanticism's position was strengthened more and more, in parallel with the emergence and consolidation of literary criticism discussed earlier. De Bruyn highlights the way that under Romanticism readers and critics began to realise that there was more to *Don Quixote* than first thought, especially by those early seventeenth-century readers who had seen nothing but a work of comic buffoonery, and also by those subsequent readers who had gone beyond this and recognised its satirical purpose. In the latter stages of the eighteenth century, and during these first two decades of the nineteenth, it came to be widely accepted that *Don Quixote* did in fact "conceal hitherto unsuspected depths" (De Bruyn 2009: 43), although the true nature and full extent of these depths had yet to be explored. Lockhart argued, on the subject of approaching *Don Quixote* as nothing more than either a comedy or satire, that "...such an aim would be unworthy of a great novel, and that Quixote himself is the universal type of idealist, the heroic altruist, the symbol of Imagination, continually struggling and contrasted with reality" (1822: lix). An overarching characteristic of De Bruyn's thinking on the place of Romanticism in British literature during the nineteenth century is that after Sismondi di Sismonde's publications the Romantic reception is laid dormant (though not extinguished). He argues that it remains so until the publication of Ormsby's introductory paratexts, which he cites as the first example of the Romantic reception's reawakening.<sup>102</sup> My thesis will seek to understand the extent to which irony, and within this, a Romantic view of *Don Quixote*, had in fact pervaded throughout the nineteenth century.

---

<sup>102</sup> See De Bruyn (2009).

In addition to De Bruyn, Hazlitt's thinking also helped lead the way for the Romantic reception of the protagonist as well as his tale, and as a result he is generally regarded as one of the all-time greatest critical thinkers of the English language. He has been described by the equally polemic literary critic and writer Tom Paulin as a "master of English prose style, a beautifully modulated general essayist" and, among other things, "both a philosopher and one of the supreme literary critics in the language."<sup>103</sup> There is no doubt that Hazlitt's literary criticism had a strongly political slant (De Bruyn 2009: 47), and in his *Lectures On The English Comic Writers* (1819) he is among the first to spot the importance of the duality and interplay between Cervantes' knight and his servant. He employs a popular metaphor at the time to describe Sancho Panza as having "his guts in his brains"<sup>104</sup> (I: 6, 62), in direct contrast to his master. In particular, Hazlitt directs his reader to the incident in the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of Part I, where Sancho ridicules Don Quixote for mistaking a barber's basin, used by its owner as a makeshift helmet, as the mythical Mambrino's helmet and subsequently charging at the barber in order to win it from him in a duel. This example illustrates that although Sancho lacks the formal education, academic intellect and intelligence usually attributed to a man of Don Quixote's social position, he far outreaches his master in terms of his common sense and worldly wit. Widely criticised in Part I for his base and vulgar tendencies, namely gluttony and material greed, under the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* Sancho's character is viewed less negatively and readers begin to acknowledge his more noble traits as well as his vulgar ones. In contrast, Don Quixote has his brains in his guts; he acts on impulse and gut feeling without any sense of consequence or awareness of how others perceive him, a constant slave to his incessant and heartfelt desire to right an endless supply of imaginary wrongs. In true Romantic style Hazlitt describes Don Quixote's reliance on imagination at the expense of common sense as a positive thing, pointing out that he is "singularly *blessed* with the instinct of imagination" (1819: 19, my emphasis). The mocking of the more aristocratic character by figures of much lower social standing such as barbers or servants reflects the Romantic tendency to react against aristocratic dominance discussed above, and Don Quixote's subordination of rational thinking in favour of emotions and gut instincts echoes another of Romanticism's

---

<sup>103</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2003/apr/05/society.history> (accessed 13<sup>th</sup> May 2016)

<sup>104</sup> Popularised by Zachary Grey's 1744 edition of *Hudibras*, and appearing gradually in subsequent translations of *Don Quixote* from here onwards. For a fuller discussion of these translations and the evolution of this metaphor, see pp.489-490 of Stanley Jones (1992: 489-90).

core characteristics. Such was the extent to which Hazlitt considered *Don Quixote*, and Samuel Butler's subsequent *Hudibras* which it inspired, to be Romantic works of literature that he refers to the day when he first read them in 1799 as "the birthday of thought and Romantic pleasure" (Jones 1992: 491).

The second period of the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote's* early nineteenth-century heyday was signified by an almost complete separation from the earlier interpretation of the novel as a comic or funny book. It is no coincidence that the years 1820-1835 also dovetail perfectly with the years when Romanticism fully arrived in England from Germany. Although written in Spanish, the first fully Romantic portrayal of *Don Quixote* in the eyes of English critics is widely considered to have come from Marchena in 1820, in the form of his *Lecciones de filosofía moral y elocuencia*. Exiled in France at the time, this was published in Bordeaux and is also the first fully idealised interpretation of Don Quixote's character written by a Spaniard outside Spain.

In addition to Hazlitt and Coleridge, Lockhart was another key player in the instigation of the wholeheartedly Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* in England during the second part of the early nineteenth century. As the author of the preface to an 1822 re-edition of Motteux's translation, Lockhart shared Marchena's view that *Don Quixote's* true purpose and significance went way beyond satire and instead presented a noble, misunderstood hero mocked by those around him as a result of their own ignorance. In the preface he describes Cervantes' novel as "a picture of national life and manners, by far the most perfect and glowing that was ever embodied in one piece of composition" (1822: lvii). Not only does this tie in perfectly with Romanticism's quintessential trait of embodying a national identity, but his words also further illustrate the emergence of the sublime into critical thinking of the day.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, the interpretation of Cervantes' novel manifested differently among British literary critics in comparison to their German counterparts. In England, critics saw much wider and more universal applications of those aspects of *Don Quixote* in which the novel embodies the concept of national identity. De Bruyn suggests that Don Quixote's character served as a mouthpiece for the author's own ideas and reflections, as opposed to a vehicle for carrying those of an entire nation (2009: 49). Such a view allows for more subjectivity in the interpretation and reception of Cervantes' novel, and by reducing it down to an individual level it enables each reader or critic to form their own assumptions. Lockhart's view coincides with De Bruyn's that *Don*

*Quixote* is not necessarily an embodiment of Spanish national identity, but rather a wider and more general mouthpiece: he said of Cervantes' knight that he is "the symbol of Imagination, continually struggling and contrasted with Reality — he represents the eternal warfare between Enthusiasm and Necessity — the eternal discrepancy between the aspirations and the occupations of man — the omnipotence and the vanity of human dreams" (1891: 53). Although De Bruyn takes the representative purpose of *Don Quixote* down a level towards the individual, whereas Lockhart goes the other way and raises it far beyond the level of one single nation, the conflicting critical views nevertheless support each other in highlighting the variation between Romanticism in Britain compared to Germany.

Another trait unique to Romanticism in England during *Don Quixote's* reception in the middle of the nineteenth century is the emphasis placed on feeling and emotions, over logical thought and rational argument. However, unlike in Germany this built upon the existing critical thinking rather than swiping it aside altogether, as had been the technique used by the German Romantics. Instead, among English readers the critical reception during the middle of the nineteenth century tended towards a "valorisation of the poetic rather than the prosaic", but although "new features are displayed, they are done so in existing features already recognised" (2009: 44-45). In other words, putting new, fresh meat onto the old bones, and this trend in critical thinking was sustained for several decades until at least the end of the nineteenth century. Morrison, for example, in the epigraph of his 1895 adaptation presents *Don Quixote* as continuing to be "a comedy to him who thinks, and a tragedy to him who feels".

In contrast to the relative lull in critical reception which occurred during the middle of the nineteenth century, the later decades presided over a significant period of critical activity and so the third phase of the Romantic reception to follow the two discussed above must be divided into three sections: the decades before the 1880s, followed by the one decade which saw the only three translations produced in England during the nineteenth century, and then the years which followed until the turn of the century. By considering each of these three stages individually, it creates a more definitive picture of the literary conditions at the time when Duffield's, Ormsby's and Watts' translations being written and then received. In doing so, this will help to explain why the translators opted for the specific translation strategies they did, and also why on several occasions they all chose the same one.

During the first of these three stages there had been a long gap since any previous translations had been produced and so from that perspective, without any basis for comparison, it is difficult to analyse any shifts in *Don Quixote's* reception closely. In fact, when searching for notable critical publications on *Don Quixote* after the middle of the nineteenth century, the only significant name which emerges is that of Spanish *cervantista* and journalist Nicolás de Benjumea. Two major points for consideration immediately emerge; firstly, that there is a limit to the number of writings that any one individual can produce at once and so Benjumea could have at best created only a handful of works on *Don Quixote*, which would have reflected only his own views and not those of a broader critical consensus. Secondly, he was writing in Spanish and this therefore immediately restricted the number of those who could be influenced by his commentary. Although these works would have impacted on those English literary critics who were familiar with the Spanish language, and subsequently have been transmitted and disseminated among their fellow English literary critics in due course, the effect of Benjumea's contribution to influencing the English reception of *Don Quixote* can at best be described as indirect, if not limited. Aside from a speech to mark Juan Valera's inauguration into the Real Academia Española in 1864, entitled 'Sobre El *Quijote* y las diferentes maneras de comentarlo y juzgarlo', Benjumea's other significant publication in relation to the topic was his *La verdad sobre El Quijote. Novísima historia crítica de la vida de Cervantes*, published in Madrid in 1878. The level of activity surrounding the same discussions in England at that time, however, did not match their Spanish counterparts and so there remains very little to use as a basis for discussion.

#### 2.10 Nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote*

Before any analysis of the three translators' works and, in particular, their handling of irony, is possible it is first necessary to look at how each of the three nineteenth-century translators' versions have been received by readers and critics. In terms of critical attention the contrast between the 1880s and the preceding two decades could barely be more pronounced, though it was admittedly a slow start. Duffield's translation was published in 1881, yet it went largely unnoticed at the time. The little critical attention that it did receive was predominantly negative, and Duffield's translation was and still is in the eyes of some

critics viewed as the least successful of all three produced in that decade (Knowles 1947: 290). Knowles is one of the few critics to write in any great length on the two nineteenth-century translations aside from Ormsby's, and even this only extends to one chapter in a critical anthology. The closest that even he gets to praising the first of the three is his description of it as "a monument to Duffield's industry and eccentricity" (1947: 290) if not his skill and competence. Aside from this double-edged compliment the remark also suggests that, although the quantity of work was there, the quality was distinctly lacking. The instances in his translation upon which Duffield collaborated with Lockhart have been acknowledged by critics as being "skilfully" written. However, Knowles bluntly comments that "Duffield's prose is less happy" (ibid). Whether this critic's choice of adjective here refers to the quality and skill of the writing, or the degree of its Romantic leanings at the expense of humour or comedy, is not clear although both interpretations are equally plausible.

While there is no doubt that the negative reception of Duffield's translation among critics far outweighed any positive attention, what is much less clear is the reason why this was the case. One explanation is that it offered too strong a reaction against the comic reception of *Quixote's* early seventeenth-century days, departing too far from the earliest lines of critical thinking and compensating too much, which resulted in a version that was too Romantic for contemporary tastes in the early 1880s. Duffield clearly states his position on how he feels Cervantes' novel should be interpreted, when he expressed his disgust and disappointment at the early comic reception: he laments at how a book "so pure in spirit and so chaste in words, so lofty in style and yet so full of human sympathy and love as *Don Quijote* came to be regarded by English men of letters as a book of lowly buffoonery?" (1880: 22). This therefore adds plausibility to the suggestion that he went too far the other way, a view put forward by Knowles when he suggested that Duffield was perhaps "haunted by the past treatment of the work... as a piece of comic buffoonery" (1947: 290). Knowles further criticises the fact that the "Victorian bias for the chaste and the moral" is overused (ibid), and indeed in his preface Duffield's makes a reference to the translator on bended knee, begging for the chance to do the original source text justice even though he knows that ultimately he cannot.

It seems too simplistic, however, to say that this alleged overly romanticised stance adopted by Duffield was the only factor in the lukewarm critical reception received by his translation. More probable is that it was a three-fold combination of this

overcompensation, the timing of his translation's publication in relation to wider literary movements in England at the time, and also the publication drought which had preceded it. In his Preface, Duffield explains to his reader that he went to Spain for several years prior to writing his translation so that he could do so equipped with a strong command of the language, something he describes in detail in his *Recollections of Travels Abroad*. From the summary he then provides in his Preface of the existing Quixote translations that came before him, and their pros and cons, it is evident that he also had a grasp of more academic aspects of critical thinking than his average reader would have. This goes part of the way to explaining why his translation was both helped and hindered by the hiatus between the early nineteenth century and his translation; although he was immersed in critical knowledge of the rise of the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote*, many his readers were not yet. This suggestion is further supported by yet more detail provided in his Preface: by aiming it at "all classes of reader", he was potentially trying to cover too broad a market and this resulted in alienating those towards the less academic or critically well-read end of the spectrum.

Had Duffield's translation been published thirty or forty years earlier, he would not have been the victim of the double-edged sword that was the lack of recent predecessor editions. It is likely that his version would have enjoyed a more sympathetic reception in England, given that mainstream Romanticism, as was considered to have died down from the 1840s onwards, would have still been at its peak thanks to the predominance of critics such as Hallam, Schelling, Tieck and Ticknor. That is not to say that Romanticism had expired and been completely replaced by other trends in literary thinking by the 1880s, but it was now no longer the only contender in the critical field. In a similar vein, had there been a steadier stream of publications, whether critical works, translations or theatrical adaptations, produced in the years prior to 1881 than there had been during the middle and earlier decades of the nineteenth century, Duffield's translation would have seemed less of a shock to readers and so had a less jarring effect against the literary backdrop upon which it was published. Instead, his translation came across as too sudden a break from tradition for English literary tastes at the time.

Knowles' view of Duffield's as the least successful of the three nineteenth-century translations is not shared by the majority of critics, and that position is generally reserved for Watts'. However, despite triggering a period of "unusual activity in all things Cervantic" (Knowles 1947: 290) and retaining characteristics which had made earlier versions so

successful, such as being published in several volumes to include sketches and a biography of Cervantes, Duffield's translation remains firmly in second place in terms of the popularity of the three produced during that decade. Ormsby's version, which followed four years later, found itself at the other end of the critical scale and is hailed by critics as one of the best translations of *Don Quixote* ever produced. De Bruyn calls it "one of the great English translations of *Don Quixote*", which "makes a significant contribution to Cervantine criticism" (2009: 48); Mayo and Ardila note that it has been "regarded as the best translation in English" (2009: 57); Jones attests that Ormsby "produced the first truly accurate English translation of Cervantes' great novel" (1980: ix); Luttikhuisen states that Ormsby has superiority over all other translators of *Don Quixote*, nineteenth-century or otherwise (2009: 91) and Knowles confirms that Ormsby's translation "has been denominated by the great majority of critics as the best in the English language" (1947: 290). The enormity of the difference in critical opinion between Ormsby's version and Duffield's is immediately evident, not only in the high praise unanimously voiced around it, but also in the sheer volume of critical commentary on his version.

Ormsby's translation has already been studied by the above critics in detail. What is nevertheless worthy of note here is that, unlike his predecessor, Ormsby had benefitted from a chance to observe first-hand how the most recent version had been received, and therefore he was able to gauge what readers and critics wanted. Like Duffield's translation, Ormsby's was also published complete with paratexts, including a biography of Cervantes, a historical introduction, notes and bibliographies. However, Ormsby had been able to observe how Duffield's was received and in doing so take the decisions not to advocate so strongly the lofty, serious and overly Romantic perspective which had brought his predecessor so much criticism. Instead, Ormsby's translation reflected his own views, which aligned with Hallam's from decades earlier, whereby he makes a conscious effort to avoid the tendency to over-idealise and staunchly rejects the concept of favouring the Romantic approach to such a degree as to eradicate elements of humour altogether. Instead Ormsby combines the two, in what is largely a reaction against the earlier tendency to view Cervantes' novel as a purely Romantic piece of literature and what he describes in his own introduction as the fact that he felt "it became almost a crime to treat it as a funny book" (1885: 54-55).

As his successor, Watts did not share the view that Ormsby's translation was as close to perfect as could ever be achieved, which he states in the preface to his version is

the reason for him setting out to produce his own. Although he pointedly withholds comment on the two previous nineteenth-century offerings, he does make the telling remark that “that I am not content with them sufficiently appears in this present undertaking” (1888: 13). Critics, however, could not have disagreed more with Watts in his opinion that his version was an improvement on the existing translations. To follow and match the success and innovative influence which Ormsby’s version had enjoyed would have been an enormous ask of any translation, particularly one produced only three years later. It is therefore hardly surprising that Watts’ “third new Englishing” (Knowles 1947: 290) struggled to win even critical acknowledgement, never mind acclaim. Whereas Ormsby’s is regarded as one of the best translations of *Don Quixote* ever written, in comparison Watts’ was much less widely circulated (Pardo 2011: 382). Though the lack of attention paid to Watts’ version indirectly makes the critical response less unwelcoming than that received by Duffield’s version, this is only due to the fact that critics have not considered the subject of Watts’ version worthy of comment at all. De Bruyn, who studies Ormsby’s translation in great detail, only goes as far as to describe Watts’ version as “one of two creditable translations of *Don Quixote* besides Ormsby’s” (2009: 49) and Knowles casts aside the paratexts included in Watts’ version when he argues that it was not until James Fitzmaurice-Kelly’s 1892 publication that we are presented with “the first attempt at something like a complete bibliography” (1947: 291). One reason for the similar lack of critical interest in Watts’ version in comparison to Duffield’s is due to the unavoidable similarities between their works. This is hardly surprising, given that they began working as a duo in a collaborative project and only went on to produce their own versions after their professional relationship floundered (McGrath 2009: 76). McGrath provides a further possible explanation for the stark contrast between the success of Ormsby’s translation compared to Duffield’s or Watts’, in the form of the higher degree of fidelity to the source text exercised by Ormsby in comparison to the other two. By resisting the temptation to overly domesticate his translation, and instead remain closer to the original, Ormsby avoided falling into the trap of creating a finished product “so smooth, so invisible, that the reader often fails to realize that the work is a translation at all” (Luttikhuizen 2009: 92). Although McGrath speculates briefly as to reasons behind this decision, if it indeed was a conscious decision on Ormsby’s part, or whether this is due to the fact that Ormsby had

much greater experience in translation theory and Cervantean scholarship<sup>105</sup>, the exact reason remains unknown.

### 2.11 The 'multifaceted' or hybrid interpretation of *Don Quixote*

What is known, on the other hand, is that the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* was not as extinct by the second half of the nineteenth century as some critics have maintained.<sup>106</sup> All three of the translations produced in the 1880s still very much acknowledged the heroic and noble qualities in Don Quixote's character and his journeys and, although each does so in varying degrees, what nevertheless stands out among them all is that they retain the Romantic stance echoed by Morrison a decade later. This seems to signal a renaissance or renewed intensification of the Romantic reception, at a time when it is considered by many critics to have run its course and expired. Despite certain lingering elements of the Romantic reception, however, there is no doubt that by the last quarter of the nineteenth century Romanticism had ceased to be the only dominant school of interpretation in literary criticism. Instead, it now shared the sphere of reception with alternative models, such as Realism, and this change which was the result of a number of factors. For one thing, later nineteenth-century Britain had by now witnessed a growing acceptance of the burgeoning capitalist marketplace, and the new middle class which it had produced. This is reflected in works such as George Eliot's *Middlemarch*, which was published as a complete novel in 1874 but was set during the years 1830-32. True to its Realist form, *Middlemarch* focuses on important issues of the day which cast a direct shadow on the characters' lives, such as the Great Reform Bill, the birth of the railways, and scientific and technological advances, among other issues.<sup>107</sup> In contrast, a Romantic novel would have emphasised the ideal over the real, and pined nostalgically after a sentimentalised bygone era and its values.

The question therefore arises as to why Duffield's, Ormsby's and Watts' translations retained any characteristics of Romanticism at all. For one thing, the source

---

<sup>105</sup> See Ardila (2009a: 76-84).

<sup>106</sup> See Sillars' (2008) definition of Romanticism in Britain; De Bruyn (2009: 47-48) refers to the legacy left behind by Romantic predecessors to the later Victorian writers, implying that the two did not co-exist; Luttikhuizen similarly comments on the Victorians continuing Romantic trends, thus implying that one followed the other (op cit: 97-98); and Close refers to Romantic thinkers during the second half of the nineteenth century as "idealists exiled in the Wilderness of the Real" (1978: 55).

<sup>107</sup> See also Kornbluh (1991: 941-967); Phipps (2011: 17-26).

text was not written during a time when Romanticism was a dominant force, and so it cannot be for the sake of fidelity. Moreover, the fact that the two literary perspectives are such stark opposites of each other also suggests that it would be impossible to adhere to both without some degree of inevitable contradiction. In fact, critics agree that this multifaceted view of *Don Quixote* is precisely what occurred.<sup>108</sup> To some extent, the hybrid reception of *Don Quixote* is problematic, in that it is difficult to pinpoint exactly which single perspective was the dominant one, or indeed where the scope of one stopped and the next started. Pardo so fully acknowledges the lack of critical exploration of the hybrid element of *Don Quixote's* reception at the end of the nineteenth century that he coined the phrase “los quijotes perdidos” (2011: 368) to refer to many of the works published which may have evaded critical analysis altogether due to the problematic nature of their identity. Like Pardo, Ruskin also promotes the hybrid reception of *Don Quixote* during the second half of the century, and in his introduction to *Modern Painters* (1860: I, 3) he argues that the knight's character embodies all those elements which are sentimental and idealised, albeit slightly distorted from reality due to his own naïveté. Meanwhile, his squire is a “realist counterweight” (ibid), and the two personalities thus combine to form what would be a fully-rounded and complete character package. This sense of equilibrium is mirrored in the three translations from the 1880s, which also represent “the culmination of a balanced attitude and synthetic aspirations characteristic of the era” (De Bruyn 2009: 49), one which undeniably occurs much later than the generally ascribed ‘Romantic period’.

Johnson argues that it is precisely because *Don Quixote* lends itself to such a varied and multifaceted interpretation that it has achieved such literary success. She acknowledges it as “the second-best-selling book in history, it includes and sums up everything that went before it and it contains the germ of everything that's come along since” (1990: 19). This view of late nineteenth-century Don Quixotes has not, however, been shared by all critics and, as Johnson herself has pointed out, throughout the centuries “every possible reading has been matched by its exact contrary” (1990: 23). Knowles, for example, uses Ruskin's *Letters in Architecture and Painting* (1853), to support his argument in opposition to Morrison's. He described Morrison's theatrical adaptation as “purely Romantic”, and in particular he attacks the affectionate bond between the knight and his niece Antonia as the “emotional pivot” (1947: 287) of the play. Giving a major role to

---

<sup>108</sup> Close describes *Don Quixote* as a “weathervane of the clichés of contemporary discourse” (2000: 243); see also Russell (1969: 325); Pardo (2011: 368).

Antonia, and thus creating a heroine as well as a hero, is not without significance either and the further fact that the plot structure culminates in a happy-ever-after outcome also helps to sustain and corroborate Knowles' argument. Morrison himself, in his preface, states that "though Cervantes sat down with no thought but that of recording the pranks of an elderly lunatic, he did not rise until he had created the Christ of fiction" (in Ardila 2009a: 50). Clearly, this rendering of both the source text and the author in such a sublime and Romantic light proves that, to some extent at least, the Romantic reading of *Don Quixote* was still very much alive at the end of the nineteenth century. Evidence to support this lies in Luttikhuisen's argument that Romantic translators followed their belief that literature as a form of art should speak first and foremost to the emotional side of man's nature, which unavoidably resulted in the frequent sacrifice of fidelity to the source text (2009: 93). As previously noted, and as an area which will receive more in-depth textual analysis in this study, Duffield's and Watts' translations exercised a lesser degree of fidelity to the original and in that sense they offer more scope for being regarded as the most Romantic of the three according to Luttikhuisen's theory. Although Romanticism had begun to give way to Realism, mirroring the opposite trend which occurred between satire and Romanticism at the beginning of the century, one had not yet replaced the other altogether. Instead, the freedom and ambiguity surrounding each reader's reception discussed earlier became more pronounced than ever. Thomson has summed the situation up perfectly in his short study published 1895, when he drew a comparison between the Earth and *Don Quixote* in which the latter consisted of "a core of scornful melancholy, set about with a pulp of satire, and outside a kind of thick burlesque irony" (in Knowles 1947: 291). This resulted in a situation where, due to the "inward gravity of his irony" (ibid), there is laughter there for those who look for it but which is sufficiently hidden from those who choose not to. George Meredith, in his *Essay on Comedy* published in 1897, addressed his Romantic readers with his recognition that "heart and mind laugh at Don Quixote, and still you brood on him" (in Ives 1998: 138).

That the inability to define a single scholarly or critical perspective occurs largely due to the simultaneous coexistence of several apparently opposing models such as Romanticism, Realism, Naturalism, and early Modernism, is therefore obvious. What is less clear is why this coexistence came about. I would argue that it is due to the specific nature and identity of Cervantes' novel, which on one hand lends itself to categorisation within a number of different literary genres, but in doing so in fact simultaneously prohibits any

fixed label being applied. De Bruyn has also argued that *Don Quixote* is difficult to define as belonging to one genre or another, highlighting that it posed a “challenge to critical preconceptions” due to its “critical flexibility” (2009: 36), and Paulson considers Cervantes’ novel to be “a work that eluded conventional critical categories” (1998: ix) echoing Close’s earlier description of the “interpretative headaches” surrounding *Don Quixote*.

### **CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS OF INSTANCES OF IRONY<sup>109</sup>**

As outlined in the earlier discussion of the methodology of this thesis, this chapter consists of the analysis of the 18 samples selected from Allen's list of 107. In each case, the passage will be presented in the original Spanish quoted from the source text, followed by each of the three nineteenth-century translations in the order in which they published, including any accompanying footnotes inserted by the translator. These four quotes in total will then be followed by a discussion and analysis, which will consider the translations both on a formal level, looking at the word choices used, as well as a wider thematic level, including the manifestation of each translator's professional and academic background in their translation strategies. In particular, this aspect of the discussion will discuss the use of footnotes, as part of a broader consideration of how scholarly a target audience each of the three translations appear to have been aimed at, and how this fits in with their detection and retention of Cervantes' notoriously subtle and elusive brand of irony. The aim of each analysis will be to identify any emerging trends or similarities between the three, whilst at the same time exploring any variations between the translation styles, the reasons for any such disparities, and how these impact on the degree to which each one successfully retains Cervantes' original irony.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> All page numbers from the source text refer to the Random House (2010) edition cited in the bibliography which accompanies this thesis.

<sup>110</sup> See page 7 of this study for a more detailed outline of how I chose these specific examples, the aims of my analysis and the projected conclusions I hope to draw from them.

1. *“Pero no he podido yo contravenir al orden de naturaleza; que en ella cada cosa engendra su semejante. Y así, ¿qué podrá engendrar el estéril y mal cultivado ingenio mío, sino la historia de un hijo seco, avellanado, antojadizo y llena de pensamientos varios y nunca imaginados de otro alguno (...)”*

(I, Prólogo: 43)

Duffield:

“But I could not oppose the order of nature, wherein each creature begets its like; which being so, what could my barren and ill-nurtured genius engender, save the history of a child, asered, shriveled, whimsical, and full of divers conceits, never fancied by another?”

(p cv)

Ormsby:

“But I could not counteract Nature’s law that everything shall beget its like; and what then, could this sterile, ill-titled wit of mine beget but the story of a dry, shrivelled, whimsical offspring, full of thoughts of all sorts and such as never came into any other imagination (...)”

(p 81)

Watts:

“But I could not contravene the ordinance of Nature, wherein each thing engenders its like. And so, what could my sterile and uncultivated mind beget but the story of a meagre, shrivelled, whimsical child, full of odd fancies never imagined by any other<sup>1</sup>...”

<sup>1</sup> In the prologue to the false Second Part Avellaneda taunts Cervantes with his faults as unnecessarily arising from the condition here alluded to; his book being written in a prison, and therefore “queroulous, grumbling, impatient, and choleric, as are those who are in imprisonment.”

(p 5)

This quote is found at the beginning of the Prologue to Part I of *Don Quixote*, at which time the author-narrator is presenting his work to the reader in a pre-emptively apologetic fashion.<sup>111</sup> He explains how he had hoped that his book would be something attractive and skilfully executed, if the adjective *discreto* is taken in the context of its early seventeenth-century meaning.<sup>112</sup> In the passage he goes on to contrast what he is actually offering with what he had hoped to offer, attributing the inevitability of this difference to his own limitations as an author. The most instantly noticeable aspect of irony in this one of the phrases identified by Allen is therefore the dominant vein of apparent self-deprecation. Typical of prologues to earlier literary works that Cervantes is more than likely to have read, in the prologue to *Don Quixote* the author-narrator suggests that any product of his literary mind will, by default, be stale and pathetic: in the author's prologue to *Lazarillo de Tormes* the reader is presented with "this little trifle of mine (written in my crude style)",<sup>113</sup> and as Narozny and Armas Wilson have noted Cervantes likewise chooses not to use his prologue as a platform to flaunt everything that is praiseworthy about his ground-breaking novel, but rather "he devotes a good portion of the Prologue to telling us what his novel is not" (2009: 146). In that sense, therefore, it would seem at first glance that Cervantes is conforming exactly to the time-honoured stereotype of ironic self-deprecation.

However, it becomes increasingly clear on closer inspection that Cervantes' underlying intention was to make a statement entirely to the contrary. It is precisely by so overtly feigning self-deprecation when presenting his novel to the reader that he in fact succeeds in his primary aim, that of parodying the falseness behind the traditionally-employed criticism by the author of himself. The most obvious clue to this lies in the last sentence, when he makes reference to "pensamientos *varios* y nunca imaginados de alguno otro" (my emphasis). By describing the thoughts expressed in the subsequent work as varied and diverse, as the term "varios" suggests, Cervantes creates an implied likelihood that they would also have occurred to other writers as well despite what he goes on to say explicitly. This phrase provides a classic example of Cervantes' own unique brand of irony, which Close notes is often hidden beneath surface meanings in the form of an "embryonic

---

<sup>111</sup> See Canavaggio (1977) for a fuller analysis of the significance of the author-narrator's use of the first person in this passage, and Avallé Arce (1976: 13-35) for the use of "estéril y mal cultivado".

<sup>112</sup>

[http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed\\_in\\_frame=0&search=discrete&searchmode=none](http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=discrete&searchmode=none)

<sup>113</sup> According to Rudder's 1972 translation.

seriousness perceptible in the absurdity” (2000: 338). This builds on the same critic’s earlier writing, in which he advocates “ways of looking at literature which presuppose that its meaning lies below the ostensible surface” (1978: 3). At first the author-narrator’s words might create an impression of thoughts never before imagined by anyone else because they are too obscure and strange to be worthy of any attention. However, the significance of this sentence hidden in the “absurdity” highlights that not only are these thoughts entirely original, they are also significant in number. This covert ambiguity forms one of Coleridge’s main areas of focus, namely his theory of conceptualisation as discussed in the previous chapter. In this specific context, the primary mental act Coleridge has noted provides the reader with what is said and, at first glance, appears to be all that is said. It soon becomes clear that the possible concept might well be very different from the real existence of this.<sup>114</sup>

Among the three nineteenth-century translators, it is Duffield’s who appears to be the most ironic in terms of the level of self-deprecation retained in his version compared to the others’. This effect is primarily achieved by his verb choice in the opening clause; his use of “oppose” implies a greater sense of futility against the natural laws of nature, offering only an impression of trying to withstand it, and does not imply any suggestion of the possibility of going beyond withstanding and succeeding in actively defeating it. Ormsby and Watts choose to stick more closely to the literal translation of the source text, opting for “counteract” and “contravene” respectively, and the prefix to both of these verbs carries a definite connotation of overturning and thwarting the laws of nature rather than merely resisting them. Duffield’s is therefore more self-deprecating, and thus more ironic, as it never allows for even momentary consideration that even the first outcome might be possible let alone the second. Moreover, the greater sense of being subservient and submissive to the power of nature in Duffield’s also presents his translation of this passage as that which most conforms to ideals which drove the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote*.

One explanation for the possible motives behind Ormsby’s and Watts’ particular verb choice is simply the most obvious one – that they favoured higher fidelity to the source text than Duffield. However, the paratexts which accompany their translations would appear to contradict this theory. Duffield, in his “Translator’s Note” preceding the first part of his translation, made no secret of the fact that in his view the best translations

---

<sup>114</sup> See H. N. Coleridge (1849:56-58) for a fuller exploration of Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s theory.

were those that stuck more closely to the source text. He states that “the closer I kept to my author, the more loyal I proved to him, and the more of a slave in bearing his words, the better would be the result of my sweet toil” (1881: xlii). On this basis, one would be forgiven for expecting his version to be the one which sticks most closely to the original, while the other two venture away from it, not the other way around. As a result, his decision to use a synonym of the English translation of *contravenir* rather than retain its literal translation indicates an intentional decision on Duffield’s part, taken in order to render his version as ironic as possible.

Aside from the issue of self-deprecation, the other factor at play in the context of this particular instance of irony is the concept of likeness, also occurring in the first sentence of the selected passage. Unlike before, this time it is Ormsby as well as Duffield who chose to break away from the direct translation in the original, and it is only Watts who retains the closer translation of “engenders”. Neither Duffield’s nor Ormsby’s paratexts offer any discussion of their reasons for this in any detail. The fact that they both began to opt for the freer translation, only to then both choose this same verb over all other synonyms, strongly suggests that there was in fact a clear and conscious reason for doing so. According to bilingual dictionaries produced from Spanish origins, such as the *DRAE*, the verb *engender* carries two very distinct potential meanings to date; that of “Causar, ocasionar, formar”, which does not carry any biological or organically reproductive connotations, as well as that of “Procrear, propagar la propia especie”,<sup>115</sup> which clearly implies a sense of generational or mammalian succession. By contrast, the equivalent bilingual dictionary published by Cambridge makes a clear distinction between the two. The first definition is regarded as the more modern or informal one, and this refers to the act of sowing seeds in a more figurative and metaphorical manner<sup>116</sup> whereas the latter, it argues, is now out of date with the exception of very formal circumstances. It is important to note, however, that both of these sources only provide a twenty-first century definition of the verb and the *Tesoro de la lengua Castellana* (1611) conveys a very different meaning of *engendrar*. According to the early seventeenth-century source it is defined as the process of “engendrar odio en los ánimos de los que nos juzgan por arrogantes. Engendrar malos

---

<sup>115</sup> <http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=engendra>

<sup>116</sup> The examples provided in the 2003 edition to illustrate this point are “ese episodio engendró la duda en él” / “that incident sowed the seeds of doubt in his mind” (p.327).

humores, piedra postema, etc. Engendrado, el producido de otro.”<sup>117</sup> Essentially, the nineteenth-century definitions have therefore discarded the intrinsically disappointing implications assigned to both the engendering process and this particular finished product, and instead view it only as a process of procreation, biological or otherwise. This is in contrast to the early seventeenth-century context in which Cervantes would have chosen this particular verb, and this difference strongly suggests that he did so in order to convey that the author-narrator is implying it would almost be arrogant to suggest that his literary mind could produce something of any notable worth. On that basis, in this case it would seem that all three nineteenth-century translations failed to detect or reproduce the original irony from the source text.

This is one of the many examples of Cervantes subtly parodying what he regarded as the pomposity, masked behind false self-deprecation, of his predecessors found in *Don Quixote*.<sup>118</sup> Close acknowledges this technique when he refers to Cervantes’ “muffled allusions” and his technique of employing irony as something towards which “we strain without precisely catching; it constantly seems to mean more than it actually means” (1973: 248). This divergence between the original seventeenth-century meaning of *engendrar* and its nineteenth-century counterpart is of fundamental importance, because it means that Duffield’s, as the only one of the three to use a literal translation of the Spanish infinitive, retains the greatest degree of Cervantes’ original irony in his translation compared to Ormsby or Watts.

Despite this dissimilarity between the two definitions, in the context of nineteenth-century translations it is possibly irrelevant: the varying definitions discussed above illustrate that, at some point between the early seventeenth century and today, a distinction was made between the two meanings. However, it is not known when exactly this occurred and if it had already done so by the 1880s. As a result each reader’s individual interpretation of the verb in question, specifically whether or not it should convey a sense of procreation rather than simply causation, is entirely dependent on their own individual approach to Cervantes’ novel. Hazlitt recognised this in his critical writings, when he argues

---

<sup>117</sup> *Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana*, p. 520.

<sup>118</sup> Other examples of this in the prologue include the author-narrator’s description of his work as being “sin acotaciones en las márgenes y sin anotaciones en el fin del libro, como veo que están otros libros, aunque sean fabulosos y profanos, tan llenos de sentencias de Aristóteles, de Platón, y de toda la caterva de filósofos” (I, *Prólogo*, p44); he then goes on to sarcastically remark “¿Pues qué, cuando citan la Divina Escritura? No dirán sino sino que son unos santos Tomases y otros doctores de la Iglesia...” (Ibid).

that it is impossible to approach any historical text without imposing one's own associations (Schneider 1933: 140), and in his essay 'The Sick Chamber' (*The New Monthly Magazine*, 1830) he recognises that books not only let us into their souls but simultaneously "lay open to us the secret of our own". Such a theory would explain why later translators might choose to opt for the more neutral, dehumanised choice of verb whereas earlier translators would have been more likely to retain the sense of procreation, and this would certainly explain why Watts chose to stick so closely to the source text. McGrath provides a strong argument in favour of this suggestion, pointing out that Watts was strongly opposed to a translator potentially choosing to "violate the spirit of the original with a translation that reflects the ideology of the society in which they live" (2009: 78), a view also shared by Duffield who argued that to do so would be "an offence as gross against good manners as against art" (1881: I, 16).

Hazlitt's definition of wit also offers a further insight into the degree of irony retained in the three translations. He defines wit as the interactive relationship between the author's mind and the work of literature it produces, and he states the wit is neither equal to poetry nor to likeness, but that it is "imagination inverted" in the form of either words, things, or sense (Schneider 1933: 144). This definition of wit is directly linked to any study of irony, which Hazlitt defines as "a species of wit which owes its effect to the contrast between the appearance and the reality" (1931: XVIII, 10). In the above passage quoted, such a contrast lies between the presupposed appearance of the *seco, avellanado y antojadizo* story that the author is describing, versus the timeless and international masterpiece which it in fact turned out to be. While all three of the nineteenth-century translators offer the same version of the last two in this trio of adjectives – "shrivelled and whimsical" – the variation between their translation choices of the first is significant. In the original Spanish, *seco* carries a variety of possible meanings depending on the context in which it is used, and it is therefore unsurprising that it should vary in the eyes of different translators. According to the *DRAE* there are 35 distinct definitions, though these all carry the same connotation of being drained or depleted, whether in the physical sense of being withered or parched, or in the metaphorical sense of being lacklustre and beleaguered.<sup>119</sup>

If irony can be equated to wit, working on the basis that Hazlitt's definition of wit is accurate, then it is Watts' translation which is most ironic in this respect. Duffield's choice

---

<sup>119</sup> There is no entry listed in the *Tesoro*.

of “asered”, according to the *OED*, refers to something dried up or withered. While this not only conveys somewhat negative characteristics about the story which follows the prologue, the primary effect of this word choice is less to do with likeness and more to do with self-deprecation again. It implies that the following story has been overworked or, more literally, overcooked and this would suggest that the comment is aimed more at the person making the remark than the subject of the remark itself. Although not the most ironic, Ormsby’s choice of “dry” is the most covert irony of all three. On one hand, it conforms to the more literal image of something *seco*, as if referring to a work of literature that is stale and defunct in that it can offer its readers nothing new and lacks any real vitality, thus coinciding with the earlier theme of self-deprecation. On the other hand, at the same time it is also very subtly and yet completely contradicted by the explicit remark made by the author, that the proceeding work is completely original. Both of these are characteristics common to Duffield’s translation as well. However, where Ormsby’s is unique is in the probable inference of his nod to the humour in Cervantes’ novel through his use of the word “dry”. The subject of Cervantes’ humour in *Don Quixote* has been widely studied,<sup>120</sup> and the *OED* definition supports the general consensus of these studies that irony is typically identifiable as a deadpan brand of “jest or sarcasm uttered in a matter-of-fact tone and without show of pleasantry, or humour that has the air of being unconscious or unintentional... in early use, ironical”. Watts’ choice, “meagre”, offers the greatest contrast between what is said here and what is meant, or what will be illustrated by the story to come. Watts achieves rendering his the most ironic of the three in this case through self-deprecation, though this is only achieved by him highlighting the total lack of any likeness between the two. The enormous contrast between this description offered to the reader of the story to come, and the pioneering landmark novel which the reader actually goes on to discover, highlights just how false Cervantes considers the traditionally self-deprecating prologues by parodying them. The fact that Watts’ choice of adjective serves only to deepen this contrast brings it to the reader’s attention even more.

There is a definite link between the first area of my analysis of the above passage, of the three translations of *engendrar*, and this second issue of likeness. Given that wit involves seeing similarities in different things according to Hazlitt’s definition as discussed, the reader unconsciously performs the ironic act of likening the author to his work. By the

---

<sup>120</sup> See, among others, Allen (2006); Highet (1963); Russell (1969); Tave (1960); and Close (2000).

author's implication of the inevitability of anything produced by his mind only ever being shrivelled, dry, or in all ways lacking, the reader is automatically drawn towards establishing an organic and causal link between the two. This is particularly relevant for any analysis seeking to understand why some translators would choose "engender" as opposed to "beget". Moreover, the juxtaposition of the adjectives immediately preceding this particular verb further accentuates the wit: although all three translators used a different adjective from each other, the contrast created between the description of the author's mind as being somehow infertile followed by the fact that it has created the following novel is equally stark and ironic. As previously noted, Duffield's is the least literal translation of *estéril*, having used "barren", whereas the other two translations not only use the same word as each other but are also, as previously, the more literally translated as "sterile".

A logical but cynical explanation for the fact that Watts follows the same translation strategies as Ormsby is very likely to be commercially-driven. As discussed in the introduction to this thesis, Ormsby's translation was by far the most critically successful and highly regarded of the two translations which preceded Watts'. It was therefore by default also the most successful of any English-language *Quixote* translation in memory among any nineteenth-century readers. It is thus hardly surprising, that of the two Watts chose to follow the one that he thought would make his own a commercial success: he openly admits in his translator's note that he considers translation as an industry to be "a harassing and jealous profession" (1888: I, xi), and he also makes no secret that he has indeed read other English translations (1888: I, vi) though he does not specify which ones. It seems probable as a result that among those he has at least read the most recent one to his, particularly given the level of widespread positive scrutiny and acclaim it had attracted. On the other hand, Watts also laments the fact that "the mischief is that it is done, and the labour can delight no more" (1888: xii), referring to the fact that his labour of love is now complete after eighteen years.

One area where all three of these translations are the same is in their highly romanticised portrayal of the subordination of human life to the power of nature. Whatever the individual wording, all three share the opinion that everything will be similar to that which came before it and created it, no matter what we try. Even when something might not in fact resemble its creator, we only have to perceive that it does for this to become the case. The most obvious counter to this argument is the perspectivist view

offered by Percas, that beauty is essentially in the eye of the beholder,<sup>121</sup> and so choosing to see something that may not actually be there in fact amounts to nothing more than imposing a Romanticised interpretation on something where one was not originally intended. It has been widely noted, as discussed in the previous chapter of this thesis, that this was one of the most common criticisms of the Romantic movement. However, whether or not a Romanticised portrayal of the power of nature put forward by these three nineteenth-century versions was naturally occurring in the source text or artificially imposed by the translators is irrelevant in this instance. Instead, what matters is that all three translators, writing under the same set of dominant social, literary and philosophical influences at that time in the late nineteenth century, conformed to the same Romantic ideal. This would strongly suggest that the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* was very much still alive and well in England long after its supposed heyday in the 1840s had ended.

---

<sup>121</sup> Percas notes that “irony depends, more frequently, upon the point of reference of the reader... and of the focus which he brings to the reading.” (1975: 648); see also Allen (2008: 117).

2. “Acontece tener un padre un hijo feo y sin gracia alguna, y el amor que le tiene le pone una venda en los ojos para que no vea sus faltas, antes las juzga por discreciones y lindezas y las cuenta a sus amigos por agudezas y donaires. Pero yo, que, aunque parezco padre, soy padrastro de *Don Quixote*, no quiero irme con la corriente del uso, (...)”

(I, Prólogo: 43)

Duffield:

“Oftimes it befalls that a father hath a child ill-favoured and without a single grace, and the love he bears it puts a bandage on his eyes, so that he sees not its faults; rather does he take them for wise and pretty things, which he repeats to his friends as wit and prettiness. But I, who, although seeming to be the father, am only the stepfather of *Don Quixote*, have no wish to be carried away on the tide of that custom (...)”

(p. cv)

Ormsby:

“Sometimes when a father has an ugly, loutish son, the love he bears him so blindfolds his eyes that he does not see his defects, or, rather, takes them for gifts and charms of mind and body, and talks of them to his friends as wit and grace. I, however – for though I pass for the father, am but the step-father to *Don Quixote* – have no desire to go with the current of custom (...)”

(p. 81)

Watts:

“A father may happen to have a child ugly and ill-favoured, and the love he bears it claps a bandage on his eyes so that he sees not its blemishes, but rather judges them to be talents and graces, and recounts them to his friends as part of wit and elegance. But I, who am a step-father, though I seem a father, of *Don Quixote*, would not go with the current of custom...”

(p. 6)

This second instance of irony, also found towards the start of the prologue to Part I, builds on the author-narrator's previously negative portrayal of his literary offering. In contrast to the first instance there is a much greater element of detachment between the creator and his creation here. Cervantes describes the way he views his literary progeny as if watching the parent-son interaction from a separate outside perspective. Furthermore, whilst in the previous extract the description of his literary work remained ambiguous as to whether or not its strangeness and rarity should be viewed in a negative light, here there is no doubt whatsoever. In the previous instance Cervantes attacks the traditionally over-pretentious and elaborate literary styles by mocking them; here totally contrasts his work with them as a means of parodying them.

This matter-of-fact and uncomplicated approach, which wastes no time in exposing the elaborate pretensions other contemporary works produced by Cervantes' peers would have hidden behind, is a prime example of the technique advocated by Cervantes as previously discussed. Moreover, his brutally honest description of his son as a child that even a parent would struggle to see anything positive in is the direct opposite of the falsehood and artificial pedantry he criticises. That said, it would be inaccurate to say that this approach is devoid of any false self-deprecation whatsoever. By stating that even the father of this 'child' would struggle to love them, before then removing himself one stage further, by explicitly specifying that he is merely the stepfather and as a result is even less likely to be able to love the child based on a sense of blinded love or even obligation alone, the author-narrator achieves two clear objectives. Firstly, he accentuates just how unlovable this literary offspring is, more so than was implied in the previous extract. Secondly, at the same time he simultaneously manages to retain just enough of the element of a parental bond with it as to enable any of its negative characteristics to be reflected onto him. This is highlighted even further by the fact that he is referring to the novel and not the protagonist, as indicated by the use of italics and, in some editions,<sup>122</sup> by a footnote to further clarify. The element of falseness is subtly illustrated by the author's use of *engendrar* and *hijo* in the previous extract, words which both carry clearly biological connotations and therefore suggest that the author-narrator is fully aware that he is not as detached from the novel as he here implies. Johnson shares this view, noting that the not only does the reference to a stepson rather than a biological son indicate proof that the

---

<sup>122</sup> Such as the one used as the basis of this thesis.

work which follows it is not original, but it is also a trait highly typical of sixteenth-century literature in Spain (1990: 38). Some of Cervantes' irony in this case therefore lies in the fact that he first of all invokes the standard analogy employed in the prologues accompanying works of literature of his day, but does so purely to then reject it and distance himself from it.

Of the three nineteenth-century translations, neither Duffield nor Watts use italics when naming the author-narrator's stepson, and while my initial assumption was that this was simply a reflection of stylistic trends in the late nineteenth century, Ormsby's version contradicts this and does italicise the book's title. Approaching this a twenty-first century perspective it would be being the norm to find the name of a book in italics, but the little research into nineteenth-century citation trends which exists appears to suggest that they did not follow the same pattern, and there is even less research available into such trends in the early seventeenth century.<sup>123</sup> Therefore, Ormsby choosing to use italics to leave the reader in no doubt that he is referring to the novel rather than its protagonist means that, to him, the reader being aware of this distinction between the two *Don Quixotes* referred to is very important. In doing so, his translation thus retains a greater degree of irony than the other two due to the lack of ambiguity.

An alternative interpretation of the purpose of Cervantes' mock self-deprecation in this extract is that the author-narrator detaches himself from his subject, in order to encourage the reader to be guided by their own impressions of his stepson and form their own opinions. In the meantime his description merely forewarns the reader of the comic protagonist to follow and the reader chooses their own direction from there. This technique is ironic in that Don Quixote's character is blissfully ignorant of the negative portrayal of him being put forward. The total lack of any deluded vanity on the stepfather's part when describing Don Quixote only serves to emphasise the knight's self-absorbed sense of grandeur in the subsequent passages of the novel by creating a stark contrast between the two.

A further notable distinction between the three translations is their portrayal of the means by which some fathers become ignorant to their children's flaws, and Ormsby's

---

<sup>123</sup> What little research there is into seventeenth-century stylistic and grammatical norms indicates there was a much greater freedom at play here than in subsequent decades. In fact, the focus of the rules governing of modern English grammar in its early days amounted to little more than a "reformed spelling system" (Linn 2008: 74). It was not until the nineteenth century that such rules became more systematised (Linn 2008: 78-79). See also Fries (1952) and Görlach (1999).

version romanticises Don Quixote's character the least of the three in this regard. While his father is merely "blindfolded" to the ugly reality of his offspring, Duffield's and Watts' fathers' love for their child "puts a bandage" and "claps a bandage" over their eyes respectively. This prevents them from recognising the ugly reality staring them in the face, but there is little or no significance to be found in the different choice of verb. Where there is a marked change between the translations, however, is their choice of noun to describe the fabric obscuring their view from their offspring's flaws. The suggestion of a bandage indicates that they regard this failure to acknowledge their child's true nature as some form of affliction, a condition that is out of their hands much in the same way as a patient may succumb to a medical ailment. Not only does this translation strategy imply that their semi-blindness is caused by factors beyond their control, but also that it is an affliction for which we as the reader should feel sympathy and compassion. Ormsby's view is much less sentimental and even allows for an interpretation that the parent, or step-parent, may have applied the blindfold themselves. In fact, the modern definition of having a "*venda en los ojos*", the wording used in Cervantes' original version, is defined by the *DRAE* as "Desconocer la verdad por ofuscación del entendimiento", the key aspect being the process of "ofuscación". Of the two definitions offered by the *DRAE*, the second does not refer to a blocking of vision, but more tellingly an "oscuridad de la razón, que confunde las ideas".<sup>124</sup> This, however, offers little in the way of settling the argument of what might have been intended by Cervantes' original Spanish, and instead leaves itself open to the individual degrees to which each of the nineteenth-century translators wanted their version to lean towards a more or less towards a sympathetic interpretation.

The definition listed in the *Tesoro*, thought to have been started in 1605 six years before its publication, provides the following definition of a "venda" which goes some way towards shedding more light on the original irony intended by Cervantes: "Esta es propia para atar, o ligar, como la venda que se atavían las sienas, para reprimir el dolor de la cabeça, que en tiempos atrás fue la insignia de los Reyes." (1611, II: 205) The use of "dolor" and "sienas" supports the translation strategies adopted by Duffield and Watts, in their perpetuation of the motifs of injury and medical ailment, and the subsequent reaction of sympathy that this invokes in the reader. In their versions, the other parents to whom the author-narrator refers choose to blind themselves to the awkward and uncomfortable

---

<sup>124</sup> <http://dle.rae.es/?id=Qwb6GTC>

reality of their situation, hiding from it in order to enable themselves to re-imagine it in a more palatable and acceptable form. This is exactly the way Don Quixote behaves in the way he constructs his image of Dulcinea in his mind, an image and belief which will govern almost every decision he makes over the course of the rest of his life. The fact that the majority of the three nineteenth-century translators also opted for the translation which most clearly portrays an element of suffering, a theme very much aligned with the romantic reception of literature, adds further weighting to the argument that the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* was by no means over by the 1880s and was in fact still a significant influence on the way in which Cervantes' novel was received at that time.

Ormsby differs further from Duffield in the grammatical voice used in the final clause of the quote analysed here, although in this instance Ormsby's version is supported and not contradicted by Watts'. When expressing his wish to avoid bowing to expected trends regarding a parent's perception of their child, Duffield's translation passively states that he has no wish "to be carried away" on the "tide" of custom. The immediately noticeable effect of that translation is its completely deterministic perspective, removing any element of choice or free will on the author-narrator's part and instead using lunar imagery to convey the helplessness and futility of any potential attempts at resistance by them. In doing so, the full extent of the force of a controlling influence, such as the moon, serves to further enhance the significance of the fact that the author-narrator has achieved the impossible and indeed managed to overcome this and form his own view of his child. In contrast to this heroic and gallant image of the author-narrator created by Duffield, both Ormsby's and Watts' translations simply state that they would not "go with" the dominant "current" of custom. This rendering implies a much greater element of choice on the individual's part, with much less scope for achieving the impossible and defeating a supra-human force. In fact, such a translation almost goes so far as to offer a cynical commentary on contemporary social customs, portraying those who do adhere to them as weak. To argue this as the driving motive behind Ormsby's and Duffield's decisions to opt for this translation, however, would overlook the obvious fact that theirs is simply the most literal and direct translation of the three, from *irme* and *corriente* in the source text. The original Spanish contains nothing of the lunar metaphor utilised by Duffield, which once again flags up one of the most common criticisms of Romanticism in literature: that deeper meanings

were so often sought and imposed where there was in reality none originally intended.<sup>125</sup> On one hand, this deviation from the true nature of the source text therefore appears to be a negative trait. On the other, the fact that Duffield opted for a translation more in line with Romantic ideals gives, albeit imposed artificially, yet another clear indication that the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* was still clearly underway during the 1880s.

An area where all three translations retain exactly the same degree of irony is their use of “wit” when referring to the excuses with which a father might pass off his son’s flaws; this is particularly striking given its juxtaposition with the fact that they all chose to translate the other of the two of the offspring’s qualities in the pair differently. Although the *DRAE* offers a modern Spanish definition of *agudezas* as both “Perspicacia de la vista, oído u olfato” and “Perspicacia o viveza de ingenio”<sup>126</sup> as well as the more commonplace perception of humour, this differs from the seventeenth-century usage of the term. While there is no entry listed in the *Tesoro*, it is known that in Cervantes’ day the concept of wit was entirely different from that of humour. The latter referred to the general emotional mood, whereas the former refers to intellectual originality and ingenuity and the ability to use paradoxes or clever verbal expressions, all of which are perfectly evidenced by Cervantes’ unique brand of irony.<sup>127</sup> Alexander Pope looks back on this form of wit and sums up a definition of it perfectly in his ‘Essay on Criticism’, where he states that “True Wit is Nature to advantage dress’d, / What oft was thought, but ne’er so well express’d” (1711, II: 90). Such a definition would therefore suggest that Cervantes’ word choice was a subtle nod to the reader of what they could expect from the irony in the proceeding chapters. By the nineteenth century, on the other hand, wit was once again regarded as a lack of gravity much more in line with the modern interpretation of its meaning as humour. The nineteenth-century critic Matthew Arnold exemplifies this when he criticises earlier authors for their “wittiness” and lack of “high seriousness” (in Cuddon 1991: 1045), and this therefore suggests that Duffield, Ormsby and Watts alike had made a conscious choice to accentuate the novel’s humorous side.

---

<sup>125</sup> See pp.96-98 for further exploration of this theme.

<sup>126</sup> <http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=agudezas>

<sup>127</sup> See Egginton (2002), Wood (2005: 2), De Bruyn (2009: 38-45), Close (1978; 2000), Riley (1962: 26-48) for detailed definitions and descriptions of Cervantes’ unique form of irony.

3. *“De todo esto ha de carecer mi libro, porque ni tengo qué acotar en el margen, ni qué anotar en el fin, ni menos sé qué autores sigo en él, para ponerlos al principio, como hacen todos, por las letras del A B C, comenzando en Aristóteles y acabando en Zoilo o Zeuxis, aunque fue maldiciente el uno y pintor el otro.”*

(I, *Prólogo*: 44-45)

Duffield:

“Of all this my book will be bereft, for I have nothing to cite in the margin, nor to note at the end; still less do I know what authors I have followed in it, in order to put them at the beginning, as all do, in A B C order, commencing with Aristotle, and ending with Xenophon and Zoilus, or Zeuxis, albeit one was a scoffer, and a painter the other.”

(p. cvii)

Ormsby:

“Of all this there will be nothing in my book, for I have nothing to quote in the margin or to note at the end, and still less do I know what authors I follow in it, to place them at the beginning, as all do, under the letters A, B, C, beginning with Aristotle and ending with Xenophon, or Zoilus, or Zeuxis, though one was a slanderer and the other a painter.”

(p. 83)

Watts:

“In all this my book will be lacking, for I have nothing to quote in the margin or to note at the end’ nor even do I know what authors I follow therein, so as to set them at the beginning, as they all do, by the letters of the alphabet, commencing at Aristotle and ending with Zoilus or Zeuxis, though the one was a libeller, and a painter the other.”

(p. 8)

This third extract follows the initially modest and almost apologetic presentation of *Don Quixote* to the reader previously discussed. However, on this occasion when comparing his own work with those of his literary predecessors, the author-narrator is much more defiant in the face of potential criticism of his work. He unashamedly refuses to make any attempt to dress up the idiosyncrasies of his literary progeny as anything positive, and any recognition of the originality of this particular literary offering was, on the surface, limited to it being described as “llena de pensamientos varios y nunca imaginados de otro alguno”. This time, on the other hand, the author-narrator defends the ways in which his work breaks the mould of pre-existing literary expectations. He even goes as far as to subtly criticise those that do conform to the trend of ostentatiously citing well-known and highly-regarded classical authors on whom they have chosen to model their work.<sup>128</sup> The narrator lists each of the deficiencies from which his book allegedly suffers, only for the friend who has recently entered the room to repeatedly point out that none of these are relevant, and yet the stepfather of the book does not stop listing them. Therefore, what at first is presented to the reader as an expression of deficiency is, in fact, a proactive advertisement of originality (Johnson 1990: 39).

Unlike the earlier presentation of the author-narrator’s work, there is in this case no victim of irony,<sup>129</sup> and instead the narrator serves as a pseudo-victim. He initially appears as the confidently deluded individual suffering at the hands of the irony’s execution, but the purpose of this apparent status as victim serves only to highlight the falseness of the veil of self-deprecation which masks the author-narrator’s words. In doing so, the author-narrator is simultaneously also the ironist, whose object is the false erudition displayed by other works of literature who have conformed to the trend of name-dropping a catalogue of highly-regarded literary figures in order to validate their work.<sup>130</sup> Instead, Cervantes unapologetically highlights the fact that his own work contains no such references and this defiant self-defence, achieved through the use of false self-deprecation, is a feature retained by all three nineteenth-century translators. It has been well-documented that Cervantes favoured an unpretentious literary style, and its apparent clash with what Cervantes regarded as the literary expectations of the day can be explained using Muecke’s

---

<sup>128</sup> Sham sums up Cervantes’ straightforward and yet very specific literary tastes: “unpretentious style, verisimilitude, variety” (2009: 243).

<sup>129</sup> Allen has termed the victim of irony as “the person whose ‘confident unawareness’ has directly involved him in an ironic situation” (2008: 139).

<sup>130</sup> Cf Allen (2008: 139).

theory of irony as a “double-layered phenomenon” (1969: 119). The lower layer, that of how the situation appears to the victim or pseudo-victim, merely shows an author-narrator stating that there are certain expected characteristics absent in his work. The upper layer, on the other hand, which shows how the situation appears to the observer, picks up on an element of indignation on the author-narrator’s part in response to the suggestion that a literary work lacking such references is somehow inherently inferior.

The degree of this indignation varies between the three translations, which suggests that all three translators did not sense Cervantes’ frustration towards established literary expectations to the same extent. As noted during the discussion of the nineteenth century in the introductory chapter of this thesis, Duffield’s and Watts’ translations generally evidence a greater degree of fidelity to linguistic and stylistic features of the source text. Their translations in this instance utilise the same syntactical structure in the opening sentence of this extract: although Duffield informs the reader that “Of all this my book will be bereft”, Watts notes that his book will be “lacking”. A common feature between the two translations lies in the connotational meaning of the adjectives used: Watts’ use of “lacking” fits most closely of all three to the intransitive verb *carecer* used in the source text, and this clearly conveys a sense of the book missing something that it would benefit from or be improved by having. Although Duffield’s choice of adjective digresses slightly from the literal translation of the original source text, in doing so he enables his version to convey this sense of lacking something vital in an even more pronounced way.

Watts’ choice of “bereft” echoes the sense that something is lacking, but that it is so greatly lacking as to warrant evoking grief and sorrow as a result. Dictionaries of etymological history support this view, specifically noting that from the seventeenth century onwards there was a specific association of this word with death (Room 1999: 58). According to the *Oxford English Dictionary of Etymology (OED)*, by the nineteenth century this past participle of the verb ‘bereave’ meant “to despoil, leave destitute, etc” (Onions 1966: 89). It therefore fits with the ironic falseness of the self-deprecation on the narrator’s part by enhancing his perceived self-pity, as it suggests that his work did at one time possess all the great characteristics he rues here but he has subsequently been robbed of them by others. Onions further expands this nineteenth-century definition by noting that the verb ‘bereave’ is rooted in the verb ‘reave’, which he defines as “to commit robbery;

despoil; take forcible possession of" (ibid). Therefore, it is not that the 'poor' narrator has lost his skill in writing, but rather it was cruelly snatched away from him.

In that sense, it is the latter of the three nineteenth-century translations which seems to be the most ironic here. The author-narrator implies that although he should feel the void left by the lack of classical citations he makes no secret of the fact that he does not suffer at all, thus suggesting that they are in fact entirely unnecessary. At the other extreme, Ormsby's version carries the least ironic translation of the three, simply stating that "Of all this there will be nothing in my book". This matter-of-fact and blunt statement which is devoid of any emotional implications differs entirely from Watts', and by choosing to say precisely what is meant rather than create different levels of meaning Ormsby's is therefore the least effective translation of irony.

Allen states that irony in the Prologue to the first part of *Don Quixote* as well as the first sally is overt, specific and comic all at once (2008: 140). There are, however, specific instances in this extract which contradict this description, not least the overt satirising of the improper practice of flamboyant name-dropping. This particular irony is overt, as both the reader and pseudo-victim (only a *pseudo*-victim because he is also the ironist) see the ironist's real intended meaning at once.<sup>131</sup> However, to say that this particular manifestation of irony is also specific would be inaccurate, as it is not clear who is being satirised by the author-narrator. Possibilities included those authors before him, the broader literary customs of the day, or the expectations of the readers themselves. This lack of clarity, as well as the overt yet unspecific nature of this irony which this creates, is retained equally by each of the nineteenth-century translators and most notably by their strategy of maintaining the structural features of this particular passage from the source text. By keeping the whole passage as one long sentence Cervantes caused the reader to gather pace automatically as they read it, and in the translations too it soon becomes little more than a roll call of missing features rather than fluid literary prose. The rambling effect achieved by this verbose syntax serves to further convey the author-narrator's frustration at the perceived expectation on him to include these listed features. However, it offers nothing in the way of indicating the precise target of these frustrations. On one hand, it appears that the mentioning of specific classical thinkers by name also provides nothing to signal this, and in fact a logical conclusion to draw as to why these were chosen above of

---

<sup>131</sup> See Muecke's comparison of different types of irony (1969: 54-119).

their peers is simply due to their positions at the very beginning and very end of the alphabet.<sup>132</sup>

All three nineteenth-century translators maintained this overt irony, but whereas Duffield and Ormsby include all four of the classical thinkers mentioned in the source text, Watts' translation contains no mention of Xenophon. One explanation for this is that Xenophon lived and wrote around the time as Zoilus, and was also heavily influenced by the same figures as he was such as Socrates, and so the omission was simply a conscious attempt by Watts to avoid duplication. Such a level of attention to detail has not been apparent in the analysis of Watts' translation so far, however, and so a more plausible explanation is that because of this overlap and Watts' lack of critical awareness of classical literature he failed to recognise the significance of Xenophon's inclusion in the original list. In particular, this is key in the context of the parallels between Cervantes' own life and that of the classical thinker: both had established military careers, both of which included a period of exile, and both worked as political representatives to their respective governments. The major difference is that Cervantes died with little money or material status, nor did he receive any of the huge acclaim deserved by his writings until after his death. He was "never completely recognised by the reigning literary lions, but definitely a presence on the Madrid scene" (Johnson 1900: 58). Xenophon, on the other hand, died "an author of a considerable oeuvre and a hero of an adventure nearly five decades old but ideologically vivid in a Greek world defined by its relationship to Persia"<sup>133</sup> and, as a result, his standing could scarcely have been higher. The effect of keeping Xenophon's name in the list is that it causes any reader with any knowledge of Ancient Greece and the Classics to draw a parallel between him and Cervantes, and also to subconsciously transfer the heroic and noble qualities of Xenophon and his works to those of Cervantes. This suggests that Watts' version was aimed at readers who may not have studied the classics, and also that Duffield's and Ormsby's translations more strongly Romanticise *Don Quixote* in relation to this particular instance of overt irony out of the three.

Further variation between the nineteenth-century translations' treatment of the classical thinkers listed is the description of Zoilus. Whereas all three note that Zeuxis was a

---

<sup>132</sup> The edition from which the source text extracts are taken goes as far as to include a footnote to justify the chosen spelling of *Xenofonte*, explaining that in doing so "mantenemos la grafía de la época para respetar el orden alfabético aludido" (2010: 44), which highlights the importance of where these chosen names fall in alphabetical order.

<sup>133</sup> See 'Xenophon' in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (2013).

“painter”, Zoilus appears in Duffield’s version as a “scoffer”, in Ormsby’s as a “slanderer” and Watts’ as a “libeller”. According to Hugh’s entry in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, the Greek grammarian’s works from the fourth century BC are best known for their own unique cynical and critical brand of Homeric scholarship.<sup>134</sup> Taken in their nineteenth-century contexts, it is Ormsby’s and Watts’ translations that most closely reflect this cynicism. According to the *Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*, published in the decade after these three translations and which therefore provides an insight into how their readers would have interpreted their meanings, the concept of ‘Zoilism’ is synonymous with “harsh, ill-tempered criticism” (1898: 976). To scoff at something carries a more comical and much less harsh connotational meaning than to slander or to libel a subject, as it does not extend beyond an expression of derision or contempt for it. The latter two on the other hand carry a greater deal of gravitas in their effect on the reader, as both imply that the comments being made against the subject are not just harsh but also false and defamatory. The effect of this heightened impact in Ormsby’s and Watts’ translations is that they conform more to the aesthetics of Romanticism than Duffield’s. By comparing any suggestion of criticism of Cervantes’ work and its lack of conformity to earlier literary norms with the description allotted to Zoilus as being harsh and critical, these translators are jumping to Cervantes’ defence when he is unable to defend himself. Not only does this powerful sense of loyalty and honour to Cervantes fit perfectly with Wordsworth’s definition of Romantic literature stated in his own preface to his *Lyrical Ballads*, as the “spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings” (1798:2), but Ormsby and Watts are also protecting Cervantes’ right to produce a work of literature from within his own imagination, something which was a key feature of Romanticism in the literary sphere. Ruthven describes Romantic literature as that which “conceives of the text as an autonomous object produced by individual genius” (2001: 40), which reiterates the earlier theory by Eco that “Much art has been and is repetitive. The concept of absolute originality is a contemporary one, born with Romanticism; classical art (...) challenged the Romantic idea of creation from nothingness...” (1990: 95). The fact that two of the three translations so clearly still adhere to one of the founding principles of the Romantic Movement provides yet more evidence that Romanticism in literature was still very much alive towards the end of the nineteenth century.

---

<sup>134</sup> See ‘Zoilus’ in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, with Hugh’s entry first appearing in the 1911 edition.

4. *“Quieren decir que tenía el sobrenombre de Quijada o Quesada, que en eso hay alguna diferencia entre los autores que deste caso escriben; aunque, por conjeturas verosímiles, se deja entender que se llamaba Quejana. Pero esto importa poco a nuestro cuento: basta que en la narración dél no se salga un punto de la verdad.”*

(I, 1: 61-62)

Duffield:

“There are people who say that his family name was Quixada or Quesada (for in this there is some difference in authors who have written on the case) although by probable conjectures we are led to believe that his name was Quixana. Yet does this concern our story but little; enough that in telling it we do not swerve one jot from the truth.”

(p4)

Ormsby:

“They will have it his surname was Quixada or Quesada (for here there is some difference of opinion among the authors who write on the subject) although from reasonable conjectures it seems plain that he was called Quixana. This, however, is of but little importance to our tale; it will be enough not to stray a hair’s breadth from the truth in the telling of it.”

(pp. 105-6)

Watts:

“They affirm that his surname was Quejada or Quesada (and in this there is some variance among the authors who treat on the matter), although by very probable conjectures we are led to conclude that he was called Quijana.<sup>1</sup> But this is of small importance to our story; enough that in the telling of it we swerve not a jot from the truth.

<sup>1</sup> The full name, as given in the Second Part, is Alonso Quijano. An endless amount of idle conjecture has been indulged in by Spanish critics as to who was meant by this name; what gentleman called Quijano or Quesada was to be found at that period in La Mancha; what was Cervantes’ motive in

choosing him for his hero; and other questions equally pertinent and interesting. Both Quijada and Quesada were well-known names in Spain at the time, the first being borne by Luis Quijada, a majordomo to Charles V, and guardian to his son Don Juan, a distinguished General, who conducted the operations against the insurgent Moriscoes in the Alpujarras, and died of a wound received in battle in 1570. The name of Quijada was that of a family in the district of Esquivias, the town from which Cervantes married his wife. One Quesada, late Governor of the Goleta, was a fellow passenger with Cervantes in the galley El Sol, when she was captured by the Algerians. *Quijada* means "jawbone". Says Coleridge, "even in this trifle Cervantes shows an exquisite judgement, just once insinuating the association of *lantern-jaws* into the readers' mind."

(p 33)

This extract appears near the beginning of the first sally, as the narrator sets the scene for the beginning of his protagonist's story and describes the man to whom the reader will shortly be introduced. It follows the narrator's acknowledgement that he cannot recall the exact name of the place in La Mancha where Don Quixote's house is found, which is then juxtaposed by the specific and detailed daily description of the inexpensive diet enjoyed by the household followed by a summary of those who make up the household and then a brief description of Don Quixote himself.<sup>135</sup>

The issue already flagged by the time the reader reaches this point in the novel, and which is further reflected here, is that of the concept of truth and its variability. In this chosen sentence there are two 'truths' mentioned; the exact name of the subject, and the wider, general accuracy in the telling of his story. Allen touches on this point briefly when he notes that in this example the target of the irony is the "confusion of verisimilitude with pseudo-historicity" (2008: 139). This is executed by the narrator as both the pseudo-victim and the ironist at the same time, though it is not clear precisely whose confusion of the two concepts is being attacked. What is clear, however, is the question raised by this irony as to whether or not truth is, in fact, all that important and if literature actually needs it in order to be regarded as functioning successfully. The important thing is not determining what exactly the knight's real surname was, but rather who he was in the eyes of the reader. This is in many ways similar to the completely different view Don Quixote has of Rocinante,

---

<sup>135</sup> See Domínguez Ortíz (1963) and Salomon (1964) for further exploration of the dominant lines within the Iberian nobility during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The vagueness surrounding Don Quixote's lineage specifically has been studied in detail by Salazar Rincón (1986: 90) and Marín (1988: 205), who suggest that his use of the title 'don' may even be illegitimate.

seeing a fine and strong warhorse where all other characters and readers see a haggard nag. On that basis, a logical conclusion is that the intended target in this case is the existing set of established literary norms and practices in Cervantes' society, and the ensuing expectations based on the standards they create. The most successful translation of Cervantes' irony will therefore be the one which continues this allowance for subjectivity and individual difference in the picture of the protagonist which is conjured up in each readers' mind; the least effective will be the one which attempts to go too far in solving the puzzle and finding a precise answer.

Of the three translations, this target is most explicitly indicated in Ormsby's; whereas Duffield and Watts simply state that the most important thing is not to deviate from the "truth", Ormsby narrows his recommendation to specifying that one must not deviate from the "truth in the telling of it". Although this could reflect either a verbal telling of the story, or simply reflect the structural tone of this written version whereby the author-narrator is speaking directly to the reader, Ormsby's translation clearly directs the irony's focus to the literary sphere whereas Duffield's and Watts' could be applied to any number of pre-existing societal constructs. A further noticeable characteristic of this extract is the presence of grammatical constructions in the source text which were no longer in use by the 1880s and so would have seemed old-fashioned to nineteenth-century readers, specifically the use of elision to create "que *deste caso*" and then "la narración *dél*". Although retaining this archaic grammar in a direct translation would be almost impossible stylistically, an equivalent method of conveying this would be very important as these constructions help anchor Cervantes' story in a specific era. That none of the three nineteenth-century translations have sought an alternative method of dating the text is no doubt due to the fact that a suitable alternative syntactical construction could simply not be found in English without altering the overall flow of the sentence, and as discussed in the introduction fidelity was an important issue to at least two of the three translators. The problematic nature of translating this particular phrase is further indicated by the fact that each of the three nineteenth-century translators has used a different choice of noun to describe the issue. While Duffield notes the degree of variation between those who write on the "case", Ormsby has used "subject" and Watts "matter"; this degree of variation perfectly reflects the difference of opinion among commentators they are writing about. Furthermore, to have used an alternative grammatical technique in order to root the story in contemporary nineteenth-century culture would have completely altered the essence of

Cervantes' story, which offers readers a snapshot and critique of the Spain and society that Cervantes knew.<sup>136</sup> Although this fits in with Ormsby's comments from his accompanying paratexts, that his intention was to prioritise fidelity to the essence and spirit of the linguistic or stylistic aspects of the story if forced to choose, it strongly contradicts Duffield's intentions regarding fidelity as discussed in the previous analysis.

That none of the three nineteenth-century translators chose to try and assimilate *Don Quixote* to their own era therefore indicates that all of them, on this occasion at least, consider its place in history to be a fundamental part of its ironic identity. On that basis, to neutralise this during the translation process would have resulted in a target text too far removed from the original and more greatly lacking in irony as a result. Instead, they chose to keep it rooted in its original century in order to create maximum effect in the minds of their nineteenth century readers, thus flagging up the irony as visibly as possible.

This clearly contradicts Pardo's view that the focus of nineteenth-century literature tended to draw more from Cervantes' legacy during the seventeenth, eighteenth and early-nineteenth century and their perceptions of him than from him directly (2011: 376). Watts emphasised Pardo's view further, with his well-known remark that to intrude one's own nineteenth-century views onto a book such as *Don Quixote* is "an offence as gross against good manners as art" (1888, I: 16). While the reference to art here refers to the stylistic consequences of deviating too far from the essence of the source text, the reference to offending good manners clearly indicates Watts' position in the timeless debate over whether or not the translator is also the author, producing their own unique work, or simply the one who manipulates the work of an existing author who still retains ownership of the text. By implying that to anchor his translation in a nineteenth-century social context would be highly offensive to the source text author, and something which should be avoided wherever possible, in doing so Watts indicates that he still very much regards *Don Quixote* as Cervantes' offspring and not his own. If it were his own then he would be free to do with it what he chose.<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> This is often particular relevance in the context of the eighteenth-century reception of *Don Quixote* in England, which leaned heavily on the use and role of satire. See the introductory chapter of this thesis for further discussion, along with Allen (1969: 3-5; 89-90); Mandel (1958: 154-155); Morera and Hanke (2005: 27-29); Ardila (2009: 124-142).

<sup>137</sup> See Venuti (1995) for further discussion of the controversies surrounding a translator's visibility in a target text.

The most noticeable difference among the three translations in the context of this particular ironic sentence analysed is Watts' abundant use of footnotes. Throughout his translation he uses them far more often than Duffield or Ormsby, and his are also consistently longer in comparison. Watts does so usually for explanatory purposes, rather than for directing the reader to external sources of supplementary analysis, and this particular extract is a classic example of that. Whereas Duffield and Ormsby offer no footnote at all attached to this sentence in their translations, Watts includes a lengthy and detailed summary of the potential origins of Don Quixote's presumed surname. This details several prominent figures from La Mancha around Cervantes' time that might have been the source of his inspiration, as well as a reference to the fact that the translation of *quijada* as "jawbone".

That this was worthy of mention to a nineteenth-century translator suggests that he in turn felt it would resonate with his readers' reception of the character to whom it refers. In nineteenth-century dictionaries,<sup>138</sup> in noun form it sheds some possible light on the issue, being defined as "a man or boy, a youth" (Oswald 1859: 124). The suggestion that one can be both a man and a boy simultaneously suggests a character comprised of two contrasting personalities, one apparently older and wiser than the other and who should know better than to create the difficult situations that Cervantes' protagonist regularly finds himself in, and the other more naïve and recklessly bullish but who is gradually maturing. Such a view perfectly encapsulates the evolution that Don Quixote's character undertakes over the course of the novel, whilst also absolving him from at least part of the blame for his foolish mistakes. The second significance of this definition lies in the fact that the term "man" also refers to the wider population as a whole, encompassing all of Cervantes' nineteenth-century readers. This universally representative image is a further repetition of the message that, although Don Quixote is undeniably fallible and guilty of errors in judgement, he is no better or worse than any ordinary person. When regarded in the infinitive form of the verb 'to jaw', there are yet more indications of the sympathetic viewpoint from which readers in the latter half of the nineteenth century regarded Don Quixote. Defined as "to cleave, split, crack or open: a cleft, gap, chink or crack" (ibid) again

---

<sup>138</sup> The original definition, in the fourteenth century, was purely that of "one of the bones forming the framework of the mouth, containing the teeth." By the eighteenth century it had evolved to describe "offensive or tedious talk", a meaning largely regarded as being coined by Smollett (Onions 1966: 493)

denotes something divided into two parts, as well as something which is not yet fully resolved and whole. This theory is supported by the fact that this particular instance of irony appears so early on in the novel, when the protagonist's evolution towards sanity and clarity is still in the earliest stages.

Ardila suggests that Watt's footnotes "provide the reader with the necessary information to appreciate the literary, cultural and historical elements of the novel" (2009a: 78). Likewise, De Wilde has suggested that any source text whose original essence is anchored in time and space "often requires annotated versions and/or it runs the risk of being dated all too soon" and becomes too far removed from later readers' understanding (2010: 26). However, in this particular instance the effect of this verbose supplementary technique is that Watts ends up both the victim and the target of his own irony: in his footnote he explains that an "endless amount of idle conjecture has been indulged in" already in search for an exact answer to the question surrounding Don Quixote's true surname, and yet he still considers it necessary to offer even more. Moreover, in doing so he does not even offer in a definitive answer and therefore what he is offering is no less "idle conjecture" than any of those earlier sources he is criticising.

The impact of diverting the reader away from the text to the long footnote disrupts the flow, and Watts' version feels awkward and clunky as a result. It also accentuates a noticeable absence in Watts' background knowledge and understanding of the source text and its author in comparison to Ormsby's, in the form of the parallel lack of clarity around Cervantes' own lineage. In the second chapter of his introductory paratexts Ormsby details the potential source of the author's surname, which bears a striking resemblance to Don Quixote's listed here:

The origin of the name Cervantes is curious. Nuno Alfonso was almost as distinguished in the struggle against the Moors in the reign of Alfonso VII as the Cid had been half a century before in that of Alfonso VI, and was rewarded by divers grants of land in the neighbourhood of Toledo. On one of his acquisitions, about two leagues from the city, he built himself a castle which he called Cervatos, because "he was lord of the solar of Cervatos in the Montana," as the mountain region extending from the Basque Provinces to Leon was always called. At his death in battle in 1143, the castle passed by his will to his son Alfonso Munio, who, as territorial or local surnames were then coming into vogue in place of the simple patronymic, took the additional name of Cervatos. His eldest son Pedro succeeded him in the possession of the castle, and followed his example in adopting the name, an assumption at which the younger son, Gonzalo, seems to have taken umbrage.<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/996/pg996-images.html> (accessed 8<sup>th</sup> May 2016)

By transplanting his own circumstances into the text under the guise of a different name, the author-narrator has once again subtly succeeded in making himself the centre of attention without letting it be obvious to his reader in a way that could draw detection or criticism. The effect that this has is another nod to the criticism of the hypocritical false erudition and self-deprecation on the part of traditional authors in Cervantes' day, of which he was so critical. Without Ormsby's literary and academic background, which had equipped him with access to information about Cervantes such as this, he would not have detected the subtlety of the irony in play here in the same way that Watts failed to.

Whilst on one hand it is true that Watts' translation stands apart from Duffield's and Ormsby's in terms of the use of footnotes, on the other hand in each of the instances of irony analysed thus far there is also a pattern emerging in terms of word choice. Ormsby's version often opts for an original translation strategy, whereas Duffield's and Watts' frequently offer the same rendering. In this current instance, the trend continues in their handling of the translation of deviating from the truth in the final clause: Duffield's and Watts' use of "swerve" as the verb and a "jot" as the unit of measurement involved is the more literal of the translations offered. In Cervantes' original he uses "un punto", which, according to the *DRAE* is the "señal de dimensiones pequeñas, ordinariamente circular, que, por contraste de color o de relieve, es perceptible en una superficie". The specific reference to its small size, and the contrast created between the marking and its background, fits perfectly with the image of the tiny ink spot referred to by Duffield and Watts. Ormsby's translation, by contrast, is much freer and he instead uses the metaphor of straying "a hair's breadth" from the truth. The fact that his chosen phrase had been in use since the 1580s, and so would have been just equally familiar to nineteenth-century readers as those in Cervantes' day alike, provides one of the few instances where the translators were able to combine the translation strategy of maintaining close fidelity to the source text whilst also executing the irony in a way that their nineteenth-century readers would recognise. Likewise, the term "jot" as an example of something as small as possible has existed even longer, dating back to the 1520s,<sup>140</sup> and so the fact that all three used this or a very closely similar alternative further supports this view. This is bolstered yet again by the fact that the definition of "punto" with which Cervantes would have been familiar when

---

<sup>140</sup> This noun evolved from the Greek "iota", adapted into Latin as "jota" referring to the smallest letter in the Greek alphabet. Cf. <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=jot>

writing the source text had changed very little in its connotations between the early seventeenth and late nineteenth centuries and the *Tesoro* lists numerous definitions:

En un punto, en vn instante. A punto, apercebido. Al punto, al momento... Sin discrepar un punto. Punto por letra, término náutico, de la compostura breve que en cada punto señala una sílaba. (1611, II: 151)

A further explanation for Ormsby's independent translation choice is that it was his attempt to incorporate a subtle and covert irony into his version: given that every reader's genetic makeup is entirely unique, and therefore a strand of their own hair will appear different to any other reader's, the parallel created by Cervantes points to the fact that the acceptable degree of deviation from any given truth therefore also varies between readers.<sup>141</sup> Hazlitt's writings reflect this suggestion put forward by Ormsby, in which he not only states that absolute knowledge is impossible for us and that all we can be certain of are our own impressions (1849: 152). In contrast, elsewhere he actively advocates emphasis on imagination over reason, arguing that it is only by each reader having their own personally subjective view of a situation that irony is possible (Schneider 1933: 141). Significantly this is also one of the few areas where Hazlitt and Coleridge's writings do not conflict with each other. Coleridge describes Cervantes' irony as being distinct from all other authors by the more subtle way in which it is employed (H N Coleridge 1849: 58), and ambiguity surrounding character names is a perfect example of this subtlety. This is no doubt due to the point in the novel at which this instance of irony occurs: as it is the very beginning of the first sally, the narrator is encouraging the reader to forge their own reality on the basis of their own instincts and gut feelings, inspired by the reader's own interpretation of the protagonist they have encountered so far. By imploring the reader to form decisions based on their senses and intuition, this passage lends itself greatly to a Romantic interpretation. On that basis it is Ormsby's, as the translation which most highlights the subjectivity of truth and irony, which most strongly perpetuates the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* in this case.

---

<sup>141</sup> Although DNA in its modern manifestation was not discovered until the 1970s, the decade in which the three nineteenth-century translations were published saw two major steps forward in this discovery process: firstly, that each cell has the same number of chromosomes, and secondly, that this number is the same for all members of a particular species. So, although understanding of the exact nature of differences between characteristics of certain human features was still very much in its infancy, it is not at all out of the question that an academic with as rounded a background as Ormsby would have had exposure to these advances in academic thinking. For further exploration of the advances made in the field of DNA during the 1880s, see De La Bédoyère (2005: 15-16).

5. “*el cura de su lugar – que era hombre docto, graduado en Sigüenza...*”  
(I, 1: 62-63)

Duffield:

“the priest of his village (who was a learned man and a graduate of Sigüenza)...”  
(p 5)

Ormsby:

“the curate of his village (a learned man, and a graduate of Sigüenza<sup>1</sup>)...”

<sup>1</sup> Sigüenza was one of the *Universidades Menores*, the degrees of which were often laughed at by the Spanish humourists.

(p 107)

Watts:

“the Priest<sup>1</sup> of his village (who was a learned man, a graduate of Sigüenza<sup>2</sup>)...”

<sup>1</sup> *El cura* – made into “the curate” by all the old translators; but *cura* is not equivalent to our English curate. He is the French *curé*, the English “rector”; the priest of the parish. In this story he plays a leading part, and is a gentleman of good sense, wit, and judgement; as I am glad to record was his representative in Don Quixote’s village when I visited in 1884.

<sup>2</sup> According to Part I, Ch.V, the priest was not a graduate, but only a licentiate. In the time of Phillip II, the living was worth 300 ducats (£35) a year. At Sigüenza, on the Henares, was a small university.”

This example of irony occurs early in the first chapter of Part I, when the narrator is explaining to the reader how Don Quixote essentially overdoses on chivalric Romances which is what then leads to him going mad and deciding to embark upon the first sally. This description quoted refers to the local priest, with whom Don Quixote would regularly get into a debate over who was the most superior of the knights of old appearing in these works of chivalry. If Don Quixote is to be regarded as mad at this stage in the novel, it is therefore important that his conversational counterpart is not speaking from a highly regarded intellectual perspective. If an intelligent, wise and sound judge were to share in *Don Quixote’s* ridiculous fascination, it would undermine his early madness and in turn reduce the scope for his later transition towards sanity. Cervantes uses irony here to

communicate to his reader that the priest is not as intelligent as one might at first assume despite his rank in the community.

The first noticeable variation between the three translations is that Watts has translated the subject of the description's role as a "priest", whereas in Duffield's and Ormsby's version he appears as a "curate". Although, as Watts goes to great lengths to point out, the English "curate" is not exactly the same as the Spanish *cura*, his implied criticism of his predecessors for choosing that translation implies that he has failed to pick up on their irony. In the case of Ormsby, he states in his Preface that his use of a marked collocation is intentional. He points out that where there is no exact and suitable alternative in English, the most effective strategy is to opt for a translation which is so obviously incorrect that it instantly jumps out at the reader as being such, thus rendering the discord so obvious that no explanation is required (1885:9). By opting for the safer, more generalised role of "priest" Watts' version lacks this irony as his chosen term is neither a direct gloss of *cura* nor a consciously visible alternative. As a result, the irony is not flagged up to his reader.

Some critics have argued that Cervantes is attacking the Church as an institution,<sup>142</sup> though there is no further evidence to support this on this particular occasion in any of the supplementary paratexts which accompanied the source text. As Allen has noted, such a contention would have to be "supported by a consistent set of covert connections together with the specification of the rhetorical signals necessary for their recognition" (2008: 141), or else any parallel must be considered purely incidental. Moreover, although Cervantes had by the time of writing *Don Quixote* made several professional enemies,<sup>143</sup> this list is not known to include any notable religious figures. In fact, Cervantes' major interactions with the church were largely positive: it was the Trinitarians Fray Juan Gil and Fray Antón de la

---

<sup>142</sup> As has Close (2000: 231), and Wilson also highlights a parallel strategy employed by Butler in *Hudibras* in emulation of Cervantes' work (1948: 48).

<sup>143</sup> It is widely suspected that Cervantes took up the position of Monsignor de Acquaviva's valet in 1569 to enable him to flee Spain and evade an outstanding arrest warrant for wounding Antonio de Sigura in a duel; in 1580 following his release from captivity he returns to Madrid to seek compensation for his military service, but this is unsuccessful and only results in him being sent on a further assignment to Oran, from where he returns in 1582 and is unsuccessful again. During his time as Royal Commissioner of Supplies (1587-1593), he is ex-communicated from both Ejica and Castro del Río for requisitioning the Church's grain. In 1589 the Viceroy Luis de Portocarrera brings charges of embezzlement against Cervantes, although these are later dropped. He was then imprisoned in 1594, when the bank into which he has deposited money acquired in his role as tax collector collapses. See Hamilton (2012b) for a further examination of Cervantes' professional history and financial troubles.

Bella who paid the sizeable ransom for his release from Hassan Baha's captivity in 1580, and so it seems unlikely that his motive for employing irony in this extract was with the Church in mind as its object. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the target of Cervantes' satire in this case is the educational background of the local parish representatives, irrespective of whether they may be a priest or indeed a curate.

It is Watts' translation which is the least successful in its execution of irony in this instance. True to form, unlike Duffield or Ormsby, he supplements his translation with a lengthy footnote, explaining not only the etymological difference between two options but also that the *cura* was a licentiate from "a small university, on the Henares". Beyond making reference to the size difference between this and other universities in Spain at the time, Watts offers no other explanation as to why this might belong to the group of universities regarded as "*menores*" in academic circles. He therefore fails to alert the reader to the true significance of this extract, and its verbosity actually bombards the reader and actually distracts them away from it with unnecessary facts (such as the annual salary of 300 ducats a year paid to a Sigüenza licentiate). The irony here lies in the fact that the reference to Sigüenza on the part of the source text author was in fact an insult dressed up as praise, and by not flagging this satire to the reader he has in turn failed to make them aware that this is an ironic reference. It is arguable that a deeper grounding in Hispanic studies or knowledge of Spanish culture at the time would have prevented this oversight, and it is telling that both Duffield and Ormsby, who did benefit from this by comparison, did not make the same error in their translations. In particular, a lack of knowledge of the literature of Cervantes' day, something which Egginton has noted is crucial to understanding what a source text author originally intended to say:

...if the methodology depends on unearthing the limits of what Cervantes could have intended to say on the basis of what others writing within his historical context did in fact say, then it runs afoul of a serious methodological quandary: the author is granted the possibility of having intended a given contribution only if the historian is able to find, in the documents forming the author's intellectual context, evidence that someone else actually uttered the intention (2002: 1042).

Duffield's and Ormsby's versions, on the other hand, minimise the use of supporting footnotes and as a result the reader is able to see the irony stand out; Duffield offers no footnote at all and Ormsby's is only very brief. In addition to being more concise, after introducing the *universidades menores* Ormsby specifically describes how "the degrees of

which were often laughed at by the Spanish humourists”, and the reader is immediately aware of who the target of Cervantes’ irony really is.

Where all three translations differ is in their handling of the syntax in the description of the *cura*. Initially it appears that Duffield’s version offers the most obvious form of irony via the use of sarcasm: when presenting the reader with the two aspects of the description of the *cura*, that he is a learned man and also that he is a graduate of Sigüenza, Duffield does not use a comma between the two but instead uses the conjunction “and”. To have used a comma would have placed the two characteristics in a list, implying some form of commonality between them as if the latter were a synonym of the former. The use of “and” instead implies that, while the two attributes are not mutually exclusive, it is nevertheless entirely possible for one to exist without the other. By contravening established grammatical conventions, and using both a comma as well as “and”, Ormsby actively emphasises this sarcasm so that it becomes clearer to the reader. This, coupled with the explicit belittling in his footnote, makes Ormsby’s version the most obvious in its use of irony and therefore the most effective, as it will be picked up on by more readers. Once again, it is Watts’ translation which offers the least effective translation of irony in this instance, as he only uses a comma which does nothing to distinguish between the two. The sole use of a comma, combined with the fact that his is so overly anecdotal, serves to doubly neutralise any ironic effect. Schneider (1933: 140) appears to offer a good explanation for Watts’ decision to rely so heavily on footnotes in his translation, arguing that it is impossible to approach a historical novel without imposing one’s own associations upon it. Unlike Spanish readers, who would be familiar with the *universidades menores* as objects of satire,<sup>144</sup> a nineteenth-century English reader would only be able to approach the text from too contemporary a perspective to pick up on Cervantes’ true meaning without his use of supplementary aids. Whilst Schneider’s argument is viable on a theoretical level, it cannot be used to justify Watts’ translation technique in this instance. Watts himself has contradicted this by previously stating, as already noted, that one should avoid intruding one’s own social, cultural and temporal influence onto a text (McGrath 2009: 78). Furthermore, as Johnson has pointed out the content of a text “needs to know the history of the language in which it was written, so that one can interpret each word according to what it meant when it was written.” (1990:2), and her point is an extremely valid one and

---

<sup>144</sup> See Escartín Sánchez’ (2003) article for further discussion on the classification of universities within Spanish society.

applies to both source texts and their translations. It is clear from the difference between the translations in this case that Watts was not familiar with the history and attached significance of “Sigüenza”, whereas Ormsby was, and it is because of this that in this case Watts’ is the least successful translation of Cervantes’ irony. Watts clearly states in the accompanying paratexts to his translation that he is not an advocate of linguistic fidelity to a source text in his approach to translating, and on that basis it could be argued that his oversight through lack of research in to the history of the language used by Cervantes could be overlooked. However, any such defence is undermined by the fact that he should have retained a degree of symbolic fidelity in the form of listing an English education which might have been viewed as inferior at the time; after all Watts states in the first volume of his translation that he has “not hesitated to take the best English word wherever I found it, holding fast to my one true purpose, which is to give Don Quixote his best English dress.” (1888: vi-vii). In reality, by choosing the translating strategy which Watts has when faced with the choice between fidelity and Anglicisation, he has succeeded in achieving neither.

6. *“que él, ansimesmo, en los años de su mocedad, se había dado a aquel honroso servicio, andando por diversas partes del mundo buscando sus aventuras,... haciendo muchos tuertos, recuestando muchas viudas, deshaciendo algunas doncellas y engañando a algunos pupilos...”*

(I, 3: 74-75)

Duffield:

“that he himself in the years of his youth, had given himself to that honourable profession, roaming through different parts of the earth seeking his adventures... doing many wrongs, requisitioning many widows, undoing some damsels, cozening many youths (...)”

(p 32)

Ormsby:

“that he himself in his younger days had followed the same honourable calling, roaming in quest of adventures in various parts of the world... doing many wrongs, cheating many widows, ruining maids and swindling minors (...)”

(p 125)

Watts:

“that he himself, in the days of his youth, had been given to that honourable profession, journeying through divers parts of the world looking for his adventures... doing many wrongs, soliciting many widows, undoing sundry damsels, and deceiving some minors (...)”

(pp. 57-58)

This extract, which occurs at the start of the third chapter of Part I when Don Quixote has not long set out on the first sally, is from a conversation between him and the keeper of the inn where he is staying. The innkeeper tells Don Quixote of his own

apparently very similar adventures, although it soon becomes clear to the reader that their two experiences could not have been more different.<sup>145</sup>

Aside from the two very dissimilar journeys being compared by the two men, what is also immediately apparent is that Don Quixote is the victim of the irony insofar as he exemplifies insensitivity to the literary expectations and flaws outlined by Cervantes in the Prologue. The ironist is the innkeeper himself and, as a result of the context surrounding the discussion, the irony is both specific and covert. From a sentimental perspective, Don Quixote's ignorance to the reality of this situation is simply the result of naïve idealism; he foolishly presupposes that everyone he meets is driven by the same robust honour code and moral compass as he is. However, a more realist approach to this scenario suggests that Cervantes' knight is successfully deceived, not as result of ingenuity, but of his own superficial shallowness. Allen is one of the advocates of this view, arguing that Cervantes' knight is not an "ingénue", but that this instance is a typical illustration of Part I of how the protagonist repeatedly ends up the victim of either the narrator's or another character's irony as a result of his own actions (2008: 132). Nevertheless, if one were to discard the excuse that Don Quixote is simply being blinded by Romantic and overly chivalric ideals as a possible explanation for why he so willingly accepts and so highly regards the innkeeper's words, it then begs the question of what the real reason was. Despite the innkeeper explicitly listing his distinctly un-chivalric actions, a likely explanation is that Cervantes intentionally wanted to illustrate to the reader just how far Don Quixote has succumbed to the influence of the outdated romances of chivalry he has been reading, and how 'mad' he really is at this point in the novel. The knight's madness is further illustrated by the fact that he so readily accepts the innkeeper's story, purely because of the way in which it is delivered in an authentically high-burlesque style. By dressing up the coarse, vulgar exploits of his travels in the manner of a tale of chivalric romance, the innkeeper plays on the fact that he somehow knows that this will be enough to fool Don Quixote. The fact that Don Quixote has proven to be a man easily wowed by style over any actual content suggests that Cervantes is making a wider satirical comment through his protagonist.

The main point for consideration in relation to the three translations is therefore how they portray Don Quixote's willingness to buy into the innkeeper's story as being

---

<sup>145</sup> See Urbina (1980) for a fuller exploration of the use of the burlesque as a means of highlighting how anachronistic Don Quixote's views on chivalry are, and how this leads him to be so naïve that he fails to see through the innkeeper's story.

anything more than the act of macho bragging that it is. The more overly-accentuated the chivalric style in the telling of the innkeeper's story, the more ironically Don Quixote would be portrayed. And yet, by highlighting his vanity and lack of aesthetic sensibility, at the same time such a representation of him would also by definition be the least romanticised. The first clear basis for comparison is the handling of the verb relating to the innkeeper's interaction with the widows, something where all three translators have uncharacteristically opted for a different word choice. Duffield refers to the innkeeper "requisitioning" them, Ormsby's version refers to him "cheating" them whereas in Watts' version he is "soliciting" them. According to the *DRAE*, the verb *recuestionar* has three meanings<sup>146</sup> but it is the third one which bears most relevance in this case, as it implies some form of deceit for sexual or amorous purposes. Bucking the newly emerging trend, it is in fact Watts' version which most accurately conveys this connotational meaning, whereas it is again Duffield's which deviates from this and offers the most literal translation. In its attempt to stick so closely to the original Duffield's version in fact loses the correct meaning altogether, it strays far beyond the prospect of simply seducing the widows and instead suggests an element of force involved. On one hand, the use of "requisitioning" does convey the lack of any regard or respect that the innkeeper had for these women, viewing them merely as commodities and prizes the way an invading army might requisition supplies or materials from the losing side, or indeed the way Cervantes himself requisitioned grain and other crops during his time working as Royal Commissioner of supplies for the Spanish Crown. On the other hand, this implication totally undermines and contradicts the dictionary definition of the source text's verb choice, that of using charm and flattery to seduce a woman, and as a result Cervantes' original irony is lost.

In contrast to their handling of the verb discussed above, repetition of an already emerging trend occurs in the translators' handling of the subsequent clause in which they refer to the unmarried women. Duffield and Watts opt for the same translation, as has frequently been the case already and, once again, Ormsby offers his own unique rendering. However, for the first time so far in this analysis, Ormsby's bucks the established trend and is in fact that version which least promotes an ironic interpretation of *Don Quixote*. The term damsel of the much-used 'damsel in distress' metaphor, consists of three significant

---

<sup>146</sup> "a. demandar; b. retar; c. Acariciar, atraer con halago o dulzura de amante." There is no entry listed in the *Tesoro*.

aspects.<sup>147</sup> Firstly, she is an unmarried woman who finds herself in some form of danger; secondly, since she has no one to protect her due to her unmarried status and is unable to protect herself, she needs to be saved by a noble and heroic male.<sup>148</sup> Thirdly, this concept is significant because Duffield's and Watts' use of "damsels" refers to an unmarried woman who is specifically both young and of noble birth,<sup>149</sup> criteria which by nineteenth-century standards would have provoked a much more sympathetic and almost protective response in the reader. In contrast, the only one of these elements that term "maid" carries is that of being unmarried. It does not have any connotations regarding social standing, vulnerability or age.

Having chosen to use "damsel", Duffield's and Watts' are the most heavily romanticised in their portrayal of Don Quixote due to the old-fashioned and archaic imagery already attached to the term by the nineteenth century. According a dictionary published in Madrid in 1864, "doncella" referred to "la mujer que todavía no ha conocido carnalmente a ningun hombre | Criada destinada a la asistencia inmediata de su señora, a cuidar su ropa, tocador, etc. | Especie de pescado parecido a la anguilla, conocido in Cádiz con el nombre de budión" (1864: 883). There is no reference whatsoever to her being of noble birth, or that she is in immediate danger and in need of rescue. This evidence shows that, even as long ago as the nineteenth century, the term was associated with old-fashioned, bygone eras and literature.

Regarding the first criteria listed above, of being in danger and in need of rescue from a "noble and heroic gentleman" (Yong 2016), Duffield's and Watts' are also the most stylistically ironic of the three, given that the nature of the tales that the innkeeper is recounting are the opposite of noble or heroic, and are in fact typical of all the things which Don Quixote has set out in his first quest to undo. That being the case, by overly emphasising the Romanticisation of irony in this extract, these two versions also inadvertently advocate a less romanticised reception of Don Quixote himself. They draw to the reader's attention the protagonist's propensity to be seduced by all things exterior and

---

<sup>147</sup> For studies into the use and historical connotations of the phrase 'damsel in distress', see Lois Tyson's book *Critical Theory Today* (2014), C J Saunders book entitled *Rape and Ravishment in the Literature of Medieval England* (2001), and K M Talarico's chapter in Peter Meister's book *Arthurian Literature and Christianity: Notes from the Twentieth Century* (2013).

<sup>148</sup> See Huang Yong's guide to *Learning Spanish Words Through Etymology and Mnemonics* (2016), as for an analysis of this phrase in a Spanish-language context, and also

<sup>149</sup> <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?search=damozel>

aesthetic and this contradicts the noble, heroic ideals attributed to the character at the centre of the Romantic approach to Cervantes' novel.

The trend of Duffield's and Watts' translations mirroring each other continues even further with their handling of the innkeeper's honourable "profession", which in Ormsby's case manifests as a "calling". Ormsby's version carries a greater sense of it being a vocation, something a person is destined to undertake, outwith their own free will. Duffield's and Watts', on the other hand carry more of a sense of individual choice, as if it is a direction a person actively chooses to undertake and for which one can be trained. To go travelling around and pursue the hedonistic lifestyle about which the innkeeper is bragging clearly points to very self-interested motives on his part, which totally contrast with the idea of answering some form of calling from a greater power. The result of this contrast is therefore that Ormsby's is more ironic in that it is more sarcastic, and this irony is also present in the source text. Although Cervantes' "servicio" has numerous meanings, depending on the specific context, all convey some sense of devoting oneself to fulfilling the needs of another rather than pursuing one's own chosen profession for one's own good. What further illustrates this difference between the two men, and should therefore be another indicator to Don Quixote that the innkeeper is not the chivalrous hero he is pretending to portray himself as, is that the innkeeper is no longer in the servitude of knighthood-errantry but is running his own profitable business for his own gain. The effect of this contrast is that as the reader's impression of the innkeeper deteriorates, it makes Don Quixote's character seem more noble and heroic in correlation.

7. *“–Señor Quijana – que así se debía a llamar cuando él tenía juicio y no había pasado de hidalgo sosegado a caballero andante...”*

(I, 5: 88)

Duffield:

“‘Master Quixada,’ (for so he used to be called when he had his wits, and had not passed from a sober gentleman into a knight-errant)...”

(p 58)

Ormsby:

“‘Señor Don Quixada,’ (for so he appears to have been called when he was in his senses and had not yet changed from a quiet country gentleman into a knight-errant)...”

(p 146)

Watts:

“‘Señor Quixada,’ for so he was named when he had his wits and had not passed from a peaceful gentleman into a Knight-Errant...”

(p 78)

This extract appears towards the start of the fifth chapter of Part I, when Don Quixote is found lying wounded at the side of the road by a passing labourer who then takes him home.<sup>150</sup> What is instantly noticeable is the parallel between the primary ironic message in this instance and the fourth instance of irony studied in this thesis; namely, the discrepancies surrounding Don Quixote’s name and line of descent. Although all three translations in the earlier instance agreed that absolute certainty is impossible, before Duffield and Ormsby concluded that his name was probably “Quixana” and Watts settled on “Quijada”.<sup>151</sup> Here, all three translators go on to contradict themselves in unison, with

---

<sup>150</sup> For further exploration of the knight’s descent into madness see Asensio (1965: 73-75) and Murillo (1986).

<sup>151</sup> Although both sound the same, in the previous instance Watts had spelled it differently.

the use of “Quixada”; this is important because it is one of the first ever occasions throughout this entire analysis where all three translations use exactly the same word, strongly suggesting that the decision to use this surname was deliberate. Moreover, they are also united in their deviation from Cervantes’ original. In the fourth instance analysed, a passage taken from the discussion around the protagonist’s unconfirmed lineage, each of the translators opted for a slightly different name from the “Quijada” used in the source text, and nor was it the case that they chose were consistent in choosing the same translation as each other. Here, that previously established norm has not been repeated with any consistency, in that they have all glossed each other’s. Moreover, as much as Watts’ lengthy footnotes jar the flow for the reader and often do not even provide them with information that is particularly useful, it is noticeable that he has chosen not to include one here in what is a very similar instance to the former. This lack of footnote, which would appear to be a characteristic feature of his translation style, combined with his decision to copy both of his predecessors, suggests that he did not detect any irony on Cervantes’ part here and so took the safe option of not deviating from the norm.

The most plausible explanation for not continuing their earlier established pattern is that, like in the fourth instance, the driving motive behind the three translators’ chosen strategies is Cervantes’ ironic comment regarding the reliability of ‘truth’ in a literary context. As Allen notes, in order to highlight the frailty and unreliability of truth in literature, Cervantes “reduces the historical rigour of the ‘true history’ to a shambles” (2008: 136). What increases the comic effect of this comment is the absolute and assured confidence with which the narrator arrogantly delivers his verdict on the protagonist’s name. The more emphatically he tells the reader that this is what Cervantes’ knight was called, combined with the surety with which the reader knows this information to be incorrect, results in the reader beginning to question what the narrator is saying in general throughout the whole novel.

This has a significant effect in the context of subconsciously sowing the seed for a more sympathetic view of Don Quixote in the reader’s mind. As a result of knowing that the narrator is incorrect in his presentation of Don Quixote’s character in this case, the reader also for the first time begins to question other things the narrator has informed them of previously and will continue to bear this questionable reliability in mind as the novel progresses. Therefore, when Cervantes’ knight is portrayed as mad or arrogant or insensitive, and generally portrayed in a farcical and ridiculous light, the reader is unlikely

to simply take this at face value as they might have before. Instead, the reader's viewpoint shifts towards Don Quixote's defence.<sup>152</sup> The reader's wariness of henceforth accepting everything told to them by the narrator in each of the three translations also conveys Cervantes' original attack on false erudition, and the confusion of verisimilitude with historicity laid out in his Prologue. The narrator is therefore the ironist and, at the same time, the pseudo-victim of the irony here, ineligible for the title of the true victim because of the internal contradiction. The objects of the irony are the literary flaws already noted.

Despite the clear overlaps between this extract and the fourth instance of irony analysed in this study, the one marked difference in this case is that it is the first time so far that all three translations have successfully spotted and retained Cervantes' original irony in equal measure. This suggests that as the translation process progresses they were gathering an increased familiarity with Cervantes style. One such example is the handling by all three translators of the adjective "*sosegado*". In a twenty first-century context, it may seem initially as though Duffield's use of "sober" changes the meaning altogether by adding in an element of drunkenness to explain the foolish mishaps that the protagonist gets himself into. However, not only is there no mention anywhere in Cervantes' novel to suggest that the knight was a drunkard, this view would also completely ignore the historical evolution of the adjective and, in particular, what it meant to readers in the 1880s. In Cervantes' day, the term was simply used to mean "vale aquietar" (*Tesoro* 1611, II: 179), though the term in fact dates back much earlier than Don Quixote's or Cervantes' era. Its initial meaning did indeed refer to someone who was "temperate in food or drink", "not drunk or drunken" (Onions 1966: 842). By the sixteenth century, this had evolved from this base level of reference to a more complex meaning, describing someone or something that was "grave, serious, sedate" or "subdued in tone" (ibid). The last shift in meaning that the *OED* cites occurs in the seventeenth century, when it referred to being "restrained in thought", with no significant alterations noted from that point onwards.

What is significant in this case is the fact that the provision of definitions as they evolved over the centuries is ample from the sixteenth and seventeenth, only for there to be a marked halt thereafter. Since there are no further changes noted, a justified presupposition would be that this same meaning endured during the nineteenth century. In describing Cervantes' protagonist as a "sober", "quiet" and "peaceful" man respectively, it

---

<sup>152</sup> This is demonstrated particularly well later on in the novel, when at the Duke and Duchess' palace where he is unwittingly the butt of the other characters' cruel tricks and jokes.

shows two things: firstly; that each of the translators was presenting the same image of him and, secondly, that they were all applying a nineteenth-century filter to this image. This filter also elevates him to a more noble position than the image that was conveyed to readers of the early translations, having afforded him more complex qualities than simply being able to abstain from drunkenness. In the eyes of nineteenth-century translators, and their readers, Don Quixote was a more complex man who was capable of being thoughtful and reflective. In doing so, this passage supports the argument that the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* was still very much alive during the nineteenth century and had in fact not faded several decades before, as is often argued by scholars of Romanticism in England.

By opting for “sober”, “quiet” and “peaceful” respectively, all three of the nineteenth-century translators in fact chose to portray exactly the same image of the protagonist as each other. It could be argued that this reflects nothing more than the fact that this particular instance of irony was one of Cervantes’ less subtle or complex ones, and therefore very easily detected. However, it also confirms that as well as sharing the same view of their source text author’s work, all three translators also held the same view of the protagonist – that he was capable of exercising qualities such as seriousness and restraint. Such a portrayal directly opposes the anti-Romantic view that Don Quixote was a chaotic and comic fool, and serves to further indicate that the Romantic reception of him was very much still alive during the second half of the nineteenth century.

8. *“hombre de bien – si es que este título se puede dar al que es pobre...”*  
(I, 7: 104)

Duffield:

“an honest man (if this name can be given to one that is poor)...”  
(p 82)

Ormsby:

“an honest man (if indeed that title may be given to him that is poor)...”  
(p 172)

Watts:

“an honest fellow (if such a name can be applied to one who is poor)...”  
(p 104)

This sentence is taken from the middle of the seventh chapter of Part I, at the start of the second sally. By this point in the novel, the link between Don Quixote’s character and the outmoded novels of chivalry is well-established in the reader’s mind and, as a result, Don Quixote serves as the target of the irony.<sup>153</sup> The narrator assumes the role of the ironist here, insofar as this is applicable in this instance at all. The limitation in relation to attaching this label to the narrator lies in the fact that in the second sally the irony tends to be more dramatized than in the previous one; in other words, there is not always a specific ironist needed for the irony to be effectively implemented. Muecke notes, however, that this dramatized irony which often occurs without an executor, should not be confused with the impersonal ironist (1969: 64-98) as was seen in the first sally, and the distinction between the two therefore marks the first significant shift in Cervantes’ irony between the two sallies. The reason for this shift is that by now, in addition to the consolidated identification on the reader’s part between Don Quixote and chivalric romances, the narrator has also succeeded in setting the stage for the forthcoming episodes in his story.

---

<sup>153</sup> Cf. Allen (2008: 142).

As such the parameters are already in place within which he has already built their own framework of expectations (Allen 2008: 143). The result is that the narrator can now withdraw, at least partially, from the forefront of the action unfolding because the characters' own self-betrayal will suffice in enabling the irony to be played out.

The "poor" man referred to in the above sentence is Sancho Panza, whom the reader is meeting for the first time as Don Quixote convinces him to become his squire and accompany him on his journeys. Despite having been brought back home by his friends following his first failed adventure, Don Quixote's obsession with knight-errantry remains as strong as ever. His niece, housekeeper, the barber and the priest have already had an ongoing discussion about which of his books to burn. In this particular quote Cervantes' irony manifests in the narrator's feigned doubt about Sancho's honour, by mockingly appearing to agree with the societal assumption of the time that honour and wealth can only ever go hand-in-hand. The narrator is therefore only a pseudo-victim because, although he agrees with this assumption outwardly with his words, his disdain for society's willingness to be won over by material wealth is patently evident in the tone and this proves that he obviously does not conform to this view.

This cynicism may well be linked to Cervantes' own real-life economic frustrations, having had problems with money throughout most of his adult life. He was imprisoned for several months in 1597 for failure to repay debts, and encountered further clashes with the Treasury in 1602<sup>154</sup> only three years before the publication of the first part of *Don Quixote*. Cervantes continually found himself struggling financially despite having served the Crown in both financial and military roles for several decades. By contemporary standards of Cervantes' day, as a financially poor man he would therefore have been considered a man lacking in honour and one who is not "*honesto*" or "*de bien*" according to the passage quoted above. And yet the fact is that even the earliest biographical resources and paratexts all point to the opposite being true,<sup>155</sup> an image which is pervaded further by the three nineteenth-century translations. Duffield describes Cervantes as "the most courageous man of his day" who, in writing *Don Quixote*, "lavished upon it not only his wit and wisdom, but also the hard-earned profit of his vast and varied experience" (1881: xli).

---

<sup>154</sup> See Hamilton (2012b).

<sup>155</sup> In particular, see Smollett's biography included in his translation of *Don Quixote* published in 1755, the first English-language biography ever to be included in a translation of Cervantes' novel, and as such one that played a pivotal role in the author's reception among English readers.

This view is echoed in the respective biographies of his two successors, and the link between Cervantes' own personal experiences and the nature of his irony in his works did not escape the notice of critics in the following century either. Auerbach states that in *Don Quixote* "well-rounded reality holds madness up to ridicule" (1953: 347), clearly suggesting that Cervantes' view of the world in which he lives has been moulded by the way in which that same world has treated him, and which he is now making the subject of critical scrutiny. With the confusion of the moral and the monetary as the object of Cervantes' irony in this quote, there emerges the second key shift in the irony of the second sally compared with that of the first: in the first sally the targets of Cervantes' irony were predominantly aesthetic, such as literary flaws and the academic snobbery they provoked. In this sally, however, the focus of the irony has moved from the field of hypothetical observation of literature and transcended into the field of real life. According to Allen, this equals a shift from the observation of literature to focusing on more ethical targets (2008: 159), and to Johnson it marks a jump from the "semiotic theme of the nature of reality" to focusing on Don Quixote as a person, in particular his madness (1990: 59). The differences between these two opinions is not overly significant in the context of Don Quixote's character evolution and what this tells about Cervantes' irony; what is important is that both represent a move away from theoretical approaches and hypotheses about the protagonist's life and the world around him, to looking at specific and real aspects of these.

A further difference between the irony earlier on in *Don Quixote* and the irony as the novel progresses, is the increasing degree of concordance between the nineteenth-century translators' treatment of it around the time of the end of the first sally and into the second. Unlike on previous occasions, not only did all three detect Cervantes' irony in this eighth instance, but they all also chose to retain it equally. This makes a bold statement regarding the significance of its original purpose as a wider social critique of societal values and hierarchies.<sup>156</sup> However, while the nineteenth-century translators may have retained it equally in comparison to one another, they did not necessarily preserve it in the same form as Cervantes in his original. As noted, Cervantes' life was to a large extent a series of unrewarded endeavours serving other people, and he died in little more than stark

---

<sup>156</sup> There is a similar attack on traditional educational and intellectual hierarchies of the day made in the fifth instance of irony analysed in this study, and of religious institutions of Cervantes' day in the final unit of analysis.

poverty.<sup>157</sup> Not least, this humble economic status is exemplified by the fact that biographers have to date been unable to research the exact house and line to which he belonged as there is no physical trace or legacy. Cervantes' protagonist lives, in his own head at least, in an idealised world ruled by Providence, where virtues are rewarded and vice is punished, a far cry from Cervantes' reality.<sup>158</sup> This naïve idealism on Don Quixote's part perfectly foreshadows Cervantes' portrayal of the malicious and cruel treatment his knight suffers at the hands of the Duke and Duchess in Part II. This would fit in, to some extent, with Cervantes' own experiences of being treated unfairly by the ruling social classes. By portraying them in such a negative light in spite of their wealth and property, as will be analysed in further detail in this thesis, Cervantes is questioning why the position of aristocracy is automatically synonymous with a qualities of nobility and respectability. He is instead cautiously suggesting, behind the guise of a fictional literary character, that one who lacks wealth is capable of not only matching another wealthier man's honour but can at times also exceed it. As Bell has observed, "poor men and peasants found in Cervantes one of their first and foremost European champions"(1947b: 262). Furthermore, this particular instance of irony is also extremely important as it sets the basis for the contrast between Sancho's low social status and his frequent moments of insight and wisdom, which Don Quixote on each occasion lacks.<sup>159</sup>

The three nineteenth-century translators lived in a time when this moral-economic confusion remained an ongoing feature of society, especially among more traditional circles, but was gradually beginning to be called into question. The Industrial Revolution, specifically the emerging middle class and greater opportunities for social mobility than ever before which it had created, meant that the automatic notion of wealth being

---

<sup>157</sup> See Hamilton (2012b).

<sup>158</sup> Don Quixote affirms as early as in Part I that "Dios hay en el cielo, que no se descuida de castigar al malo ni premiar al bueno" (I, 22:231).

<sup>159</sup> To name only a few examples here, Fernández Morera and Hanke have discussed the way Don Quixote started out "naïve at first, then increasingly shrewd", which they attribute in a large part to the role played by Sancho as his "translator and commentator" (2005: 31); they describe Sancho during the earlier stages of the novel as the "dialogue partner and rational counterpart to the mad knight" (2005: 49). Russell cites Samuel Butler's acknowledgement that Sancho is entirely capable of displaying wordly wisdom at times even if he does lack any formal education, with his comments from his Essay on Wit and Folly that "the Author of *Don Quixot*, makes Sancho (though a Natural Fool) much more wise and Politique than his master with all his Study'd and acquired Abilities." (in Russell 1969: 316); and Ardila describes Don Quixote and Sancho as a "pair who represent the opposition of idealism and realism" (2009a: 21). The fact that Sancho sees through the falseness of Don Quixote's offer in the next instance of irony to be analysed and declines to sit with him is further testament to the degree of insight and wider social understanding he is capable of.

inextricably linked to honour and virtue was no longer accepted as readily.<sup>160</sup> Their decision to retain this ironic questioning of the confusion of the moral and the monetary could therefore have been driven by their own contemporary motives, rather than fidelity to Cervantes' original, and closer analysis of the quote suggests that this is in fact the case. According to the *DRAE*, the use of "*de bien*" as an adjective is "Dicho de una persona: honrada, de buen proceder".<sup>161</sup> All three nineteenth-century versions, however, have deviated from the original and translated this description as "honest". Although honesty is arguably a major component of honour, it fulfils only one of the criteria of "knowing and doing what is morally right",<sup>162</sup> and thus leaves out other components such as selflessness, bravery, virtue and integrity. Indeed, this multifaceted definition of honour had already been identified as early as 1755 by Dr Samuel Johnson, which he termed "nobility of soul, magnanimity, and a scorn of meanness".<sup>163</sup> Honour is therefore more than just honesty on its own, and this was a definition which educated and literate people such as Duffield, Ormsby and Watts would have undoubtedly been familiar with. The fact that all three chose not only to deviate from the original, but did so in the same way by unanimously opting for the same alternative, suggests that this decision was a conscious one and adds further weight to the argument that despite recognising and maintaining Cervantes' irony aimed at the confusion of the moral and the monetary, their motives for doing so were not the same as his and they were in fact subject to cultural and temporal influences of their own day.

---

<sup>160</sup> Searle analyses the relationship between wealth and honour in depth; he states that "service was superior to money-making" (1998: 34).

<sup>161</sup> <http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=de%20bien>

<sup>162</sup> <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/honour>

<sup>163</sup> Johnson (1755: 970).

9. *“- Porque veas, Sancho, el bien que en sí encierra la andante caballería, y cuán a pique están los que en cualquiera ministerio della se ejercitan de venir brevemente a ser honrados y estimados del mundo, quiero que aquí a mi lado y en compañía desta buena gente te sientes, y que seas una mesma conmigo, que soy tu amo y natural señor; que comas en mi plato y bebas por donde yo bebiere; porque de la caballería andante se puede decir lo mesmo que del amor se dice: que todas las cosas iguala.”*

(I, 11:126-27)

Duffield:

“That you mayest know the good that is comprehended in knight errantry, and how quickly they who exercise it themselves in ministering to it come to be honoured and esteemed of the world, I desire that thou seat thyself here, at my side, and in company with these good people, and be one and the same with me, who am thy master and natural lord, and eat of my dish, and drink of the cup of which I drink; for of knight-errantry may be said the same as of love; that it levels all things.”

(pp. 124-125)

Ormsby:

“That thou mayest see, Sancho, the good that knight-errantry contains in itself, and how those who fill any office in it are on the high road to be speedily honoured and esteemed by the world, I desire that thou seat thyself here at my side in the company of these worthy people, and that thou be one with me who am thy master and natural lord, and that thou eat from my plate and drink from whatever I drink from; for the same may be said of knight-errantry as of love, that it levels all.”

(p 204)

Watts:

“That thou mayst see, Sancho, the good which is contained in Knight Errantry, and, how fair a chance they have who exercise themselves in ministering after any fashion thereto to come shortly to be honoured and esteemed of the world, I desire that here by my side, and in the company of these good people, thou seat thyself, and be one and the same with me that am thy master and natural lord, and eat of my dish and drink of the cup from which I drink; for of Knight Errantry may be said the same as of Love, that it levels all things.”

(p 140)

This quote appears during Don Quixote’s second sally, describing a scene where he is sitting down with a group of shepherds to eat their evening meal and invites Sancho to join them.<sup>164</sup> This invitation is very publicly and condescendingly extended to the squire, as if Don Quixote is trying to portray himself as suddenly being equal to the shepherds, and yet Sancho declines his offer. The fact that Don Quixote and, more specifically, his false humility, is the target of the narrator’s irony is instantly apparent, not least by the fact that immediately following this selected quote he grabs Sancho by the arm and forcibly pulls him to the ground to sit with them giving Sancho no choice but to make his master look good to the rest of the group. The irony therefore functions predominantly in the creation of the contrast between the apparently self-effacing and humble nature of the gesture, seemingly to remove any social hierarchies that divide a knight and his squire, versus the vanity and egotism so clearly revealed by the driving motive behind such a gesture by Don Quixote – to be honoured and esteemed by the world around him. Aside from the obvious conclusion to draw, that Don Quixote’s motives for inviting Sancho to join him and their hosts for the evening cannot be all that sincere if he is only doing it in order to boost his own reputation and standing, it is also noticeable that at no point prior to this in the novel has he ever once extended the same courtesy. The obvious reason for this difference is that here he has an audience, whereas his selfish motives could never be fulfilled if there were no-one else there to witness his false gesture as on previous occasions when the two men had stopped to eat.

---

<sup>164</sup> For an in-depth analysis of the discourse in *Don Quixote* see Maravall (1976: 197), Romiti (1990: 41-48) and Moore (1993: 129-130), among others.

One feature all three of the nineteenth-century translations have in common, for the second time, is the fact that each translator detected and retained Cervantes' irony equally, though in this case it is in the form of the intentional self-betrayal by Don Quixote's vanity, hypocrisy and arrogance. This is most obvious in the structural aspect of this quote, specifically the fact that in each version it is kept as one long, rambling sentence. This style far exceeds normal nineteenth-century expectations, which although still often retained examples of longer Ciceronian prose,<sup>165</sup> were beginning to favour shorter sentences than previously (Smutterberg 2005: 89). And yet despite the contemporary trend towards shorter sentence lengths, each of the nineteenth-century translators kept this particular quote in its original structural form. By doing so, its effect becomes overdramatic, almost to the point of being a monologue. The use of high-burlesque humour to connote the fact that Don Quixote is confusing something as trivial as sitting down with the rest of an already socially mismatched group with the embodiment of knight-errantry's formerly esteemed position in the world perfectly illustrates his deluded pomposity. He continues this blind arrogance by going on to compare knight-errantry to love, when erroneously he tells Sancho that it "levels all" (Duffield, Ormsby) or "levels all things" (Watts). Not only is this parallel he draws entirely false, since in spite of where he might sit in the circle Sancho will remain Don Quixote's squire and Don Quixote will remain his master, but it is also vainly misled in its implication that knight-errantry possesses the same universal, eternal, powerful and enduring qualities – beyond the control of any human – as love does. By retaining this particular irony all three of the translators are suggesting that Don Quixote's disconnection from reality stretches further than literature, outdated though this literature may be, and in fact affects his entire world-view. This farcically ironic effect is further accentuated by Don Quixote's failure to acknowledge that although his chosen vocation may have once been highly regarded among society, this is no longer the case and has not been so for several generations. The fact that here they have maintained exactly the same structure in their handling of this quote is further confirmation that each of the three translators recognise the significance of this irony, particularly in the context of how infrequently the translators have all opted for the same translation strategy until now.

---

<sup>165</sup> "Cicero's unique and imperishable glory is (...) that he created a language which remained for sixteen centuries that of the civilised world, and used that language to create a style which nineteen centuries have not replaced, and in some respects have scarcely altered." (MacKail 2004: 43); Cf. Gunnison and Harley (1912: xxiv).

The translations also all share a common handling of how barely disguised Don Quixote's vanity and selfish ambition are that drive his hypocrisy. For example, when referring to the speed with which a knight-errant will come to acquire respect and esteem from other members of the wider community, despite having each opted for a different adjective all three of the translations carry the same element of pace. Duffield's "quickly", Ormsby's "speedily" and Watts' "shortly" convey equally the fact that Don Quixote is not pursuing a life in his chosen vocation purely for the purpose of gaining renown or prestige, but of acquiring this as fast as he can. This is further illustrated across all three translations by the fact that Don Quixote implores Sancho not to join the whole group, but instead to come and sit at "my side", and be the same with "me who/that am thy master and natural lord". Not only does this show how he wants to remind Sancho and everyone else watching of his superiority, he also wants to be able to bask in the glory of this seemingly selfless act on his own without having to share it with anyone else. The result of these selfish motives is that they completely undermine any element of Don Quixote's apparent attempts to temporarily level the group to one common and equal status. In fact, he is only inviting Sancho to sit in their circle in the first place to boost his own perception and esteem among the shepherds. The fact that once again all of the nineteenth-century translators have detected and retained this same irony indicates that it was not only intentional on Cervantes' part, but shows that they considered it to be integral to the progression of the portrayal of Don Quixote's character throughout the novel. The irony lies in the vain, ambitious and egotistical aspects of Don Quixote's character seen here. It is made all the more dislikeable because among his current company he is the highest-ranking social member of the circle, and Cervantes' criticism of false erudition and hypocrisy among those of allegedly greater social standing is a target at which he repeatedly aims his ironic criticism. The irony is so effectively executed by Cervantes, and detected by the translators, because they are universal aspects of human nature with to which every reader can relate. They are significant to the plot because of the way they will provide such a stark contrast to the reflective and self-aware protagonist on his deathbed at the end of the story.

In spite of these two areas of common overlap between the three translations, and this instance is the one in which so far their translation strategies have been the most similar, their treatment of irony in this passage is not entirely without its variations. The first example of this is illustrated by the overly exalted description of Don Quixote's knight-errantry, almost to the point of sarcasm, found in Duffield's and Watts' versions. Building

on an already-established trend whereby Duffield and Watts offer the same translations to the reader whilst Ormsby's stands alone; the former refer to the act of "ministering" act of knight-errantry, whereas the latter simply refers to those who "fill any office in it". The two commonly recognised connotations surrounding the act of ministry, of either attending to the needs of someone or something, or acting as a minister of religion<sup>166</sup> both imply a level of devotion, dedication and self-sacrifice comparable to religion, in this case suggesting an element of divine calling or a sense of serving a greater power by being a knight-errant. In contrast, although Ormsby's translation still conveys a sense of position and authority, it is done so on a much more worldly level and one might "fill any office" in any number of professions entirely unrelated to religion or a divine ruling power. The significance of this variation between the translations is that Duffield's and Watts' lend themselves to a more Romantic reception, on the basis that the religious connotations in theirs nod towards elements of the sublime. As Coleridge noted, everything can be sublime but nothing is until it is looked at as such, stating that:

I meet, I *find* the Beautiful - but I give, contribute or rather *attribute* the Sublime. No object of the Sense is sublime in itself; but only as far as I make it a symbol of some Idea. The circle is a beautiful figure in itself; it becomes sublime, when I contemplate eternity under that figure. (Twitchell 1983: 21, my italics)

This is of particular relevance in relation to Cervantes' protagonist, as the presence of the sublime contrasts directly with the classic Platonic notion of beauty,<sup>167</sup> a description which perfectly fits everything that Cervantes' knight embodies. Therefore, the more 'mad' and socially detached Don Quixote's character appears, the more he can be described as going beyond the measurable and beyond rational thought, and in turn facilitates a sublime interpretation by the reader. It is obviously impossible to say with absolute certainty, however, that this selective attribution of sublime qualities is an intention which may or may not have been present in the source text author's mind at the time of writing (Esterhammer 2000: 56). It is merely sufficient to note that the implied connection between Don Quixote's pursuits and divine holiness evokes in the reader a loftier sense of awe and grandeur than is found in Ormsby's mundane and ordinary description. The fact that the sublime was a branch of critical thought generally regarded as having its heyday during the

---

<sup>166</sup> <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/minister?q=minister>

<sup>167</sup> See Edmund Burke's *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1756), Joseph Addison's *The Spectator* (1711), Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Judgement* (1790), and the Preface to Victor Hugo's *Cromwell* (1827), for further discussion of this dichotomy.

nineteenth-century decades of the Romantic period, thanks to its connection with landscape and the prominence of landscape in nineteenth-century art, its presence in these three translations further suggests that by the 1880s the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* was still very much underway and is advocated most strongly here by Duffield and Watts.

Where Duffield's version differs from both Ormsby's and Watts', a rarity so far in this analysis, is in its handling of the second verb in the first clause and offers the most pronounced portrayal of Don Quixote's vanity. Ormsby's and Watts' use of the verb "contain", in Don Quixote's urging of Sancho to familiarise himself with the good that is found in knight-errantry, implies that these positive aspects and qualities are definitely there to be found by all who look. Duffield, on the other hand, translates the same verb in this clause not as 'contained' but as "comprehended". This instantly causes the reader to question whether or not these good qualities to which Don Quixote refers are there after all, or if they are simply seen to be there, and this subsequently raises two potential questions. Firstly, it voices the suggestion that knight-errantry perhaps may not be the entirely honourable profession it is made out to be by Cervantes naïve and deluded protagonist, and whether it is in fact more akin to the *honroso servicio* so fondly recalled by the innkeeper in Chapter 3. Secondly, the reader is all this time mindful of the fact that Don Quixote has never previously exerted himself before to go to any lengths in order to remove any social barriers between Sancho and himself when there has not been an audience present. In contrast, now that he is surrounded by others, he is all of a sudden only too keen to extend this courtesy and to do so in a way which everyone else present cannot fail to notice. The fact that all three of the translations remind Sancho that Don Quixote is, even throughout this verbose invitation, his "master and natural lord" behind the thinly veiled attempts to suggest otherwise, immediately give away the fact that Don Quixote does not believe in what he is saying in the slightest. One suggestion here is that Cervantes is levelling a wider social critique, aimed on the surface at the shepherds for failing to see through Don Quixote's hypocrisy. As a result, Cervantes is attacking the society in which he lives for being too easily fooled by over-exaggerated displays of mock humility belying arrogant insincerity and falseness; the object of this attack could potentially be the Church, politics, or society as a whole. Although such an assumption might be too speculative to allow for firm conclusions, the fact that it is an irony to which all three of the nineteenth-century translators obviously related makes this too substantial

a possibility to be overlooked altogether. The fact that it has also been picked up on by other Cervantine scholars adds further weight to this argument, having noted that Cervantes' work harboured a "dangerous, subversive potential in their own time", and in doing so he simultaneously "assured the creation of all permanently unresolvable problems of interpretation for all the generations of readers who have come along since, whose lives were not circumscribed by the oppressive realities of Spanish life in 1600" (Johnson 1990: 11).<sup>168</sup> In other words, Cervantes kept himself aloof and untouchable on both sides; free from reprisals from Spanish authorities in response to his criticism of contemporary customs and institutions on one hand, and never quite within the reach of his readers' full understanding of his works on the other.

---

<sup>168</sup> Johnson lists two examples of this social critique. She argues that in (I: iv) silk merchants heading from Toledo to Murcia represent *conversos* whilst Dulcinea represents God. She also argues that in (I: xxv) the substitution of the rosary beads with a shirt at best renders the symbolism of the rosary beads meaningless, as it can be so easily replaced with such an everyday object, and may go even further to the point of being "downright unchristian" since the replacement is made from "what people used before the invention of toilet paper" (1990: 13-14).

10. *“Habíales contado Sancho al cura y al barbero la Aventura de los galeotes, que acabó su amo con tanta gloria suya...”*

(I, 29: 316)

Duffield:

“Sancho had rehearsed before the priest and the barber the adventure of the galley-slaves which his master had achieved with so much glory.”

(Vol. II, p 44)

Ormsby:

“Sancho had told the curate and the barber of the adventure of the galley slaves which, so much to his glory, his master had achieved...”

(Vol. II, p 91)

Watts:

“Sancho had related to the Priest and the Barber the adventure of the galley-slaves, which his master had achieved with so much glory...”

(Voll. III, p 95)

This instance of irony appears at the end of Part I and refers back to an incident which occurred earlier in Chapter 22, when Sancho had warned Don Quixote not to interfere with the group of galley-slaves they encountered during transportation. Despite these warnings, Don Quixote had risked the wrath of the four armed foot soldiers and two on horseback to free the men who, in his eyes, were innocent and worthy of liberation and yet subsequently turned on him and Sancho and robbed them both. Following the earlier incident, Sancho feared repercussions from the Holy Brotherhood and so urged Don Quixote to flee to the mountains immediately. The reference to the previous incident is in passing only; there is by this stage no need for the author to go into any detail as the

frameworks of irony are long-since in place and the reader is “properly orientated by their presentation”, with “their” referring to previous episodes within Part I.<sup>169</sup>

Although still in Part I of Cervantes’ original, this quote appears at the start of Volume II of both Duffield’s and Ormsby’s translations, and the start of Volume III of Watts’ (as already noted, Watts’ entire first volume consists of paratexts and he only begins his Prologue in his second). The significance of the location of this particular quote, unlike all others previously analysed, is that in Ormsby’s and Watts’ it is preceded by an opening sub-caption at the start of the Volume, which is indicative of the changing shift in the translators’ perceptions of Don Quixote’s character. Ormsby’s was the only version to offer an equivalent description at the start of the first sally, at which time he introduced the story of the “famous gentleman of La Mancha” (1885: 105), and the transformation between that protagonist and the one with which the reader is presented at this stage is remarkable. Ormsby opens the second Volume of his translation by introducing the reader to “our love-stricken knight” (1885: 91); although Watts did not include a parallel description at the opening of the first sally, the likeness between his introduction of the reader at this stage to “our love-sick knight” compared to Ormsby’s is more than striking. It clearly shows that both translators now view the knight’s tale in a much more sentimental and idealised light than previously, which suggests that their view of Cervantes’ irony has also evolved accordingly. It shows that Ormsby is now well on his way to viewing Don Quixote’s character as the idealised, noble hero the Romantic reception portrayed him as, whereas this was not obviously the case earlier. Whether or not the same can be said of Watts, given his already emerging tendency to simply copy one or both of the earlier two translations, cannot be said with the same degree of confidence. Although Duffield’s second Volume does not open with a similar offering, the fact that all three translations of this instance of irony are some of the most consistent and similar across all instances analysed would imply that he therefore also shares this shift in his view of Cervantes’ protagonist.

In all three translations the first of the objects of Cervantes’ irony is Don Quixote’s failure to recognise the priest and barber for their true characters, instead believing the priest’s story that he is simply a victim of mugging by the freed criminals. The second object

---

<sup>169</sup> Both Mancing (1982: 85) and Unamuno (1905) have studied the significance of this final stage in Part I in relation to the protagonist’s forthcoming transition toward sanity in Part II. For an in-depth exploration of the wordly wisdom and shrewdness in dealing with other characters which Sancho displays from time to time throughout the novel, see Joly (1975) and Molho (1976) among others.

of Cervantes' irony here is vanity, both Don Quixote's overt vanity and Sancho Panza's more concealed vanity. Don Quixote's lies in his overly keen willingness to be swept up in a clearly ridiculous story about a lubberly giant having ejected Dorotea from her fictional kingdom of Micomicon, and Sancho's is in his unwillingness to accept a governorship over a territory which would offer him black African subjects, having gone to the trouble of proudly confirming with the reader earlier in Chapter 21 that "Yo Cristiano Viejo soy"<sup>170</sup>. All three translations maintain equally that Sancho went out of his way to construct this ironic deceit of Don Quixote in advance, all therefore agreeing that Sancho is the ironist.

In fact, unlike previous instances of irony analysed in this thesis, here it is not the case that two of the nineteenth-century translations have opted for the same translation strategy as each other, leaving one – normally Ormsby's – to take its own path. There is only one area where the three translations differ significantly from each other, which is their handling of the verb in the first clause, describing Sancho passing the story of the galley slaves on to the priest and the barber. As was the case in the first instance of irony analysed, when looking at the issue of self-deprecation Duffield's stands alone here too as the most ironic, and yet at the same time it is also somehow the one which least lends itself to a Romantic reception. Whereas, on other such occasions when Duffield's has been the most ironic translation, for example in the first and sixth units of analysis, the opposite was true. In his translation of *contado* as "rehearsed", Duffield's version conveys a distinct theatrical connotation which is altogether lacking in Ormsby's use of "told" and Watts' use of "related". This has two major effects; firstly, it subtly introduces a comically arrogant element to the scene, as the reader instantly pictures the inelegant and ungraceful Sancho attempting to act out the how he intends the current scenario to unfold, with the priest and the barber following suit. Although precise descriptions of Sancho's physical features and characteristics are extremely few in number, unlike those of his master Don Quixote, the reader bases their impressions on what they do know of him: uneducated, bungling, vulgar and arrogant; secondly, from the translation of his surname as 'paunch' or 'belly' the mental image created is one of a lumbering, clumsy and awkward man quite unaccustomed to being on stage in front of an audience. This imagery is especially important when

---

<sup>170</sup> Despite his lesser education and lower social standing than his master, Sancho boasts the fact that he has descended directly from Christian ancestors, whereas it is implied that this is not the case for Don Quixote. See Taur (2011: 145-148) for an in-depth analysis of the reasons for this suggestion, and the significance of the contrast between the *cristianos viejos* versus the *cristianos conversos* or *nuevos*.

considered in the context of the different purposes of literature versus the theatre. Whilst literature could occasionally have sought to entertain its readers it did so through the formal written word, and so it also served a more classical and serious purpose to inform, or at least offer, a more high-brow form of entertainment, especially in Cervantes' day. On the other hand, due to its wider target audiences and the lower social classes to which it appealed and for whom it made the arts accessible, theatre relied only on audiences being able to understand the visual messages and meanings and so its primary purpose was to entertain.

This is, of course, made even more humorous by the fact that there would have been absolutely no need to go to any such trouble at all, as Don Quixote even failed to recognise the priest when he arrived and so the degree of deception required was in actual fact minimal. It could be argued that this comic aspect of Duffield's translation means that of all the three nineteenth-century translations, his lends itself the least to a Romantic reception of *Don Quixote*. By advocating a reaction of humour and jest in the reader, Duffield's version appears to hark back to the earlier stages of *Don Quixote's* reception among English-language readers as a funny book, entirely devoid of any further hidden depths than laughter. But such a view would be missing the wider picture, as it is in fact this deception which endears Don Quixote's character to the reader even more than before, as we now see him being mocked and duped not only by strangers with no emotional investment, such as the galley slaves or the farmer to whom Andrés belongs, but by his friends and the man who should theoretically be his closest ally. The reader is informed of how Sancho has communicated to the priest and the barber the incident of the galley slaves which Don Quixote executed "with so much glory" (Duffield, Watts) / "so much to his glory" (Ormsby). This additional clause at the end of the above quote is entirely superfluous, as the reader is already aware that the priest and barber are already complicit with Sancho in his deceit, and its only effect is to create additional sarcasm. The result of its inclusion is therefore an increasingly sympathetic and almost protective view of Don Quixote on the reader's part.

Because Sancho is not only involved in the deception of his master, but also in fact instrumental to it, his standing in the reader's estimations falters here. Not only because he is deceiving his master who, despite being wide of the mark in the practical execution of almost every good deed he carries out nevertheless does so on the basis of genuinely good and honest motives, but also because he is deceiving his naïve master for his own gain as

already discussed. The negative effect of Sancho's decreased position in the reader's standing correlates directly to the positive shift this mirrors in Don Quixote's. The more the reader criticises and disagrees with Sancho for deceiving his master here, the more they both pity and also develop a sense of protectiveness towards Don Quixote. He becomes in the reader's mind a helpless and hapless victim, unwittingly tricked by those who purport to be his friends and should therefore be looking out for him, foreshadowing events to come in the Duke and Duchess' castle later in Part II.

This raises a key question which by the end of the second sally has become impossible to ignore – is Don Quixote the innocent and naïve ingénue who suffers for his noble beliefs (Muecke 1969: 51), or is he fully aware of his actions the whole time and he simply suffers the consequences of his vices as the victim of the irony of others or of events (Allen 2008: 159)? The element of dramatic rehearsal and premeditation involved in Duffield's use of "rehearsed" makes his the nineteenth-century translation which most lends itself to viewing Don Quixote as an innocent and unwitting victim. It portrays a sense of the other characters' plotting, having conspired and collaborated behind his back in order to play a trick on him, the end result of which would be Don Quixote ending up the victim of the irony at play here. In that sense, Duffield's translation is thus most aligned with Muecke's view. Watts' use of "related" carries some slight connotation of the theatrical, but not enough to sustain the argument that he viewed Don Quixote as an ingénue. In fact, Watts' translation of this quote offers very little insight into his perspective of this issue whatsoever, which begs the question as to whether or not he was aware of the debate at all. Ormsby's, however, is bursting with his opinions on the innocent naiveté, or lack thereof, of Cervantes' protagonist. This is evident through both the vocabulary and the syntax. In a direct comparison to Duffield's "rehearsed", Ormsby opts for a simpler and more functional translation which lacks any semblance of a theatrical air whatsoever. Although it is the closest alternative to the Spanish *contar*, by translating the verb from the source as "told" it removes some of Sancho's role as the instigator of the trickery, and instead implies that Sancho merely provided the barber and the priest with the necessary facts in order for them to carry out the deceit independently. Armed with this information supplied, they went on to form their own views of Don Quixote's debacle with the galley slaves, and the fact that both characters unanimously reached the same conclusion – that it was in fact a debacle and not an honourable achievement – is indicated by the use of

knowing sarcasm in each of the descriptions of the execution of his interference with so much “glory”.

By directly glossing the word choice used in Cervantes’ original, each of the three translators rely on the biblical connotations of *gloria* to poke fun at Don Quixote’s deluded arrogance, and the way he regards his disastrous interventions from a perspective immensely detached from reality. Although all three versions use more or less the same wording for the final clause in this quote, Ormsby changes the word order to bring the expression forward to the middle of the sentence. This interrupts the flow of the reading of this sentence, and when read aloud lends itself very easily to sounding like sarcasm. In addition to the audible flags pointing to Cervantes’ irony, by moving it forward and making it into a subordinate clause Ormsby is also required to frame it in commas, thus making the irony stand out visually on the page as well. In doing so, it is immediately flagged up to the reader that these words were not needed in order for the sentence to retain its original meaning. The marked effect of this on the reader is that they automatically question why they have been left in, to which the obvious answer is for wry effect and emphasis. In contrast, in Duffield’s and Watts’ version, the sarcastic reference to Don Quixote’s supposed glory is tacked onto the end of the clause. This is where, when considering the flow of the syntax, one would expect to find this expression. However, by opting for this path of least resistance, Duffield and Watts’ irony jumps out to grab the reader’s attention much less forcefully.

11. “- *Voto a mí, y juro a mí, que no tiene vuestra merced, señor don Quijote, cabal juicio.*”

(I, 30: 322)

Duffield:

“I vow and swear that your worship, Sir Don Quixote, are not in your right mind!”

(p 54)

Ormsby:

“By my oath, Senor Don Quixote, you are not in your right senses...”

(p 100)

Watts:

“By my body I vow and swear, Sir Don Quixote, that your worship is not in your right senses!”

(p 105)

This quote appears at the start of the second sally and follows an ongoing discussion between Don Quixote and the fictional Princess Micomicona about her situation, and the suggestion that the two should marry. In it, Sancho Panza expresses his frustration and disagreement with his master’s decision to decline the offer on the basis that his only true love can ever be Dulcinea. After having co-engineered the preceding deception along with Dorotea, Cardenio, the priest and the barber, Sancho’s outrage reflects the fact that in refusing Micomicona’s hand in marriage the group’s plan to lead the unwitting Don Quixote back to his home in La Mancha has stalled. From his own individual perspective, Sancho is only too aware that until this happens the chances of him receiving the island he has been promised by his master upon completion of their adventures remain slim. What Sancho does not grasp is that Dulcinea, in fact, fulfils a utilitarian purpose as a safety barrier for his master, because as long as he continues to profess his undying loyalty to her he has an excuse to shy away from any situation involving himself and any other women which may present itself, for example, in the Maritornes incident in (I: 29). Moreover, Dulcinea’s character also serves as a means of indicating the increase in Don Quixote’s self-awareness, as part of his transition towards sanity and complete lucidity. This occasion in Part II is the

second time that the knight has failed to pursue the situation when their attempts to seek Dulcinea out were unsuccessful, having already occurred previously in El Toboso. The strength of Don Quixote's apparent love and adoration for her makes it seem odd that he would so easily give up in the face of Sancho's apparent attempts to engineer a meeting between the pair. The only explanation for this is that on some level Don Quixote has always known that his beloved damsel is not real, and by the second part his capacity for reality and self-awareness has reached such levels that he can no longer deny it to himself. As Egginton has noted, the three functions of irony are as the "paradox of self-consciousness", the "epideixis of infinity" and the "structure of love" (2002: 1046). Don Quixote must therefore play along with the pretended plan in order to avoid having to confront reality fully, as his transition towards sanity is not yet anywhere near the point where he is ready for this, whilst simultaneously ensuring that any direct contact between him and Dulcinea is avoided at all costs. As one critic has noted, Don Quixote "comes to realise that his own existence depends on this myth." (Johnson 1990: 61) This strongly suggests that Cervantes' knight always knew deep down that achieving complete sanity would result in his death, and his relationship with Dulcinea therefore represents Cervantes' irony in the form of the author's view on the death of ideals.

Sancho's character plays an instrumental role here in relation to the execution of Cervantes' strategies of irony, for two reasons. Firstly, he takes any suggestion of the role of the ingénue away from Don Quixote and takes it on himself; and secondly, in doing so he reveals the truth within a situation to the reader without him even knowing it (Allen 2008: 144). Sancho has at no point consciously acknowledged, either to Don Quixote or to the readers, the greed and the unwavering ambition he harbours to acquire and govern land.<sup>171</sup> He does not need to, however, as the force of his reaction to Don Quixote's decision and the sheer extent of his frustrated anger immediately draws the reader's attention to the existence and enormity of it. Being so blinded by his desire to acquire his promised island renders Sancho unable to approach a situation from any other perspective, preventing him from seeing the full reality before him. As Johnson has noted, Sancho's overwhelming desire for a governorship has nothing to do with "sanctity of goodness or sacrifice or even just living right, but is simply the shortest route to celebrity status." (Johnson 1990: 14)

---

<sup>171</sup> Although Sancho does not get his first taste of governing his fictional island until (II, lxii), as early as (I, vii) he presses Don Quixote to tell him more about the offered governorship as they set out on the start of the second sally, and makes him promise that it will be a big island (pp. 105-106).

In contrast, by refusing to marry a woman he does not love and forsaking his true love in the process, Don Quixote appears before the reader as a noble, loyal and honest man of great integrity while Sancho appears petulant and selfish in comparison. Sancho simply cannot understand why anyone would turn down the chance of a marriage such as this one which would offer such material gain and power, and this confusion on his part is an ongoing theme during this stage of the novel. Later on in Chapter 35 the narrator reminds the reader of this when he informs them that “estaba peor Sancho despierto que su amo durmiendo: tal le tenían las promesas que su amo le había hecho” (377). The fact that any infamy or notoriety which Don Quixote’s escapades and seemingly heroic deeds have brought him so far is one of ridicule and mockery, with people under the impression that he is mad, strongly indicates that fame is not one of his driving motives and in fact he is entirely oblivious to how he is perceived by others. The effect of this comparison between the two men is that from this point in the novel onwards the reader regards Don Quixote’s character in an increasingly positive and respectable light, progressing even further in the character shift already underway as discussed earlier, while Sancho continues to be viewed in a negative light.

Don Quixote’s character also takes on a major role in Cervantes’ strategies of irony at this point, as he now becomes the ironist, as opposed to being the object or victim of irony, as was usually the case before.<sup>172</sup> In contrast, he is now the agent of Cervantes’ irony, the vehicle through whom it is executed, as it is by criticising Don Quixote that Sancho’s greed and ambition, along with society’s wider confusion of the monetary and the moral, are simultaneously brought before the reader and mocked. The significance of this new role is two-fold; not only does it signify the beginning of a change in Don Quixote’s character from his foolish status at the start of the Prologue to his position of respectable self-awareness by his deathbed scene at the end of Part II, but it also sheds light on the ingénue debate in favour of Allen’s argument. The roles of ingénue and ironist are mutually exclusive, as there would be no reason why any character would choose to execute irony if they would suffer as a result. Therefore, whatever may have been the answer to Muecke and Allen’s debate previously, by this stage in Part I it is clear that Don Quixote is definitely no longer a naïve and ignorant innocent victim of an intolerant society all of the time, but

---

<sup>172</sup> See Allen (2008: 115-117; 138-141 and 157-159) for an outline of the various roles required in the construction of an ironic situation, and the characters who assume these during the course of the novel.

rather he oscillates between falling victim to his gullible tendencies some of the time, whilst at others being a proactive agent of irony in full control of his own motives and techniques. Allen shares this view that Don Quixote has not lost his ingenuous traits altogether but instead he now falls victim to them only some of the time, while on other occasions he has successfully become a user of “overt oratorical irony” (2008: 145). Moreover, he argues that this transformation is “a matter of capital importance in Cervantes’ strategies of irony” (2008: 144). In fact, as a result of his obsession with the non-existent island promised to him it, is now Sancho who begins to display some qualities of the ingénue and who assumes the role of the victim of Cervantes’ irony here. However, Sancho cannot fulfil the criteria as well as Don Quixote, as said by Muecke previously, because his capacity for self-deception is not as great. Whereas Don Quixote is ‘mad’ when he fights giants and frees wronged slaves, Sancho is merely greedy and vain when he dreams of governorship. Cervantes subtly highlights this difference by ensuring that Sancho suffers direct repercussions as a result of his greed whereas, although others might suffer as a result of Don Quixote’s misguided intentions, the knight himself never endures any negative consequences. One example of this occurs later on in the second sally, during the episode involving Mambrino’s helmet, when Sancho seizes the opportunity to swap his old paddlesack for the barber’s which is newer and in better condition. When the pair encounter the barber again later in the story, Sancho and the paddlesack are recognised and he is accused of theft.

As has been the case on numerous previous occasions, Ormsby’s use of syntax differs from Duffield’s and Watts’, who opted for the same translation strategy. In Ormsby’s version, the clause containing Sancho’s remark forms the start of a much longer sentence made up of several clauses, which closes with a question mark. Both Duffield and Watts have instead isolated Sancho’s remark and closed it using an exclamation mark. The consequence of this is that, unlike on previous occasions, when Ormsby’s differentiation from the other two has meant his was the most effective translation of Cervantes’ original irony whilst Duffield’s and Watts’ mirrored each other exactly, this time Ormsby’s translation conveys the original irony the least effectively of the three. By using a question mark, the tone created in Ormsby’s is little more than a curious questioning, as if Sancho is reluctant to risk annoying Don Quixote with his statement. This tone carries very little emotional force, not least the sense of anger, frustration and impatience which becomes instantly apparent on reading Duffield’s and Ormsby’s. Moreover, by flowing from Sancho’s statement into the rest of the sentence in Ormsby’s version, his verbal attack on his master

blends in with the following lines and any effect it did have on the reader is diminished. In the other two translations the standalone unit, at the end of which the reader is naturally forced to pause before reading, distinguishes this statement from those which immediately precede and follow it. The separating effect of the structure of Duffield's and Ormsby's, along with the greater sense of hysteria, result in the irony being presented to the reader in a much starker and more emphatic way whereas in Ormsby's it simply fades away as the sentence is read.

The element of frustration and highly-charged emotion in Duffield's and Watts' translations is key, as Sancho's annoyance stems from and directly correlates to his obsession with his island. The more frustrated he seems, the greater his craving for his island becomes and the more he wants the island, the more he becomes blinded to the bigger picture. By not conveying this annoyance and therefore this blindness to a wider reality, Ormsby prevents Sancho from assuming the role of the gullible ingénue. By doing this he also therefore inhibits the parallel transition of Don Quixote from ingénue to ironist. In the context of the ongoing theme of Don Quixote's character evolution throughout the novel, the role swapping is one of the most subtle examples of Cervantes' irony so far. Sancho appears in an increasingly greedy and selfish light but is universally regarded as not being mad, whilst Don Quixote is viewed by all his fellow characters as mad but devoid of negative personality traits like Sancho's. Therefore, the question is raised from a moral point of view as to whether it is in fact not better to be 'mad', as the reader begins to like who Don Quixote is as a person more than they do Sancho, a feature which will remain crucial in ensuring the successful completion of Don Quixote's character evolution later on.

One of the primary indications that this transition in Don Quixote's character is by now underway is the use of the title with which other characters and the narrator refer to the protagonist. Since I: 1 he was presented as the "anonymous hidalgo" (Johnson 1990: 58), but by Part II he is referred to by the narrator and other characters as "Don Quixote"; he has "literally formed himself... he has a history, and through it a character" (ibid).<sup>173</sup> In their treatment of the title that Sancho uses to address Don Quixote in the source text, once again Ormsby's is unique while Duffield's and Watts' are identical. And, like before, it is once again Ormsby's translation which least effectively translates Cervantes' irony.

---

<sup>173</sup>Johnson has analysed the significance of the various levels of meaning of the use of "Don" in the protagonist's title, and how these contribute to an increasingly noble and esteemed view of his character, particularly when "Don" is taken in its literary context (1990: 42).

According to the *DRAE*, “*vuestra merced*” is a general term used to address someone of rank or honour where no specific title for such a position exists.<sup>174</sup> By including this in their translations, Duffield and Watts initially appear to be implying some degree of respect and manners on Sancho’s part when speaking to Don Quixote, as if reminding him that despite his offensive suggestion he still courteously observes the fact that Don Quixote is his master. However, this is contradicted by the syntactical emphasis previously discussed, they both used the punctuation that would most strongly emphasise the unguarded bluntness of Sancho’s statement. It is unlikely that they would choose to lean the other way now, and so the most plausible reason why they retained and directly glossed Sancho’s words is sarcasm.<sup>175</sup> The insincerity of them apparently offering Don Quixote the courtesy and formality expected in the master-squire relationship is immediately apparent, since they are openly insulting him by suggesting he is mad. It is therefore precisely by using the customarily appropriate title that Sancho is in fact showing his disrespect. Ormsby, on the other hand, chooses to omit this use of a title altogether. In doing so the element of sarcasm is lost from the sentence, and the full impact of Cervantes’ irony along with it.

In spite of this, the translation of Cervantes’ irony is not lost in Ormsby’s version, as omitting the use of this title from Sancho’s address to his master is a continuation of Cervantes’ criticism of the confusion of the monetary and the moral. Sancho’s frustrated anger stems from his awareness that Don Quixote is still not in a financial position to give him his promised island. As a result, it seems his master is no more worthy of the respect which he has shown him until now than he himself would be if he had more money and wealth. Ormsby’s translation has so far been the one which most consistently detects and retains Cervantes’ irony, and there is no apparent reason why his ability to do so should fail in this case. On this basis, it is actually therefore Ormsby’s version which most effectively highlights Sancho’s negative personality traits which emerge via his bitterness and frustration towards his master.<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>174</sup> “Tratamiento o título de cortesía que se usaba con aquellos que no tenían título o grado por donde se les debieran otros tratamientos superiores” <http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=merced>

<sup>175</sup> Their nineteenth-century approach appears to reflect the same view Cervantes is likely to have originally intended, given that the *DRAE* definition of “*merced*” is very similar to the *Tesoro*: “Es una cortesía vñada particularmente en España, como en Italia la señoría, que es común a qualquier hombre honrado, y entonces se dize derechamente de la palabra meritú, que por ser persona que merece ser honrada, la llamamos *merced*.” (1611, II: 108).

<sup>176</sup> For an in-depth exploration of the negative aspects of Sancho’s personality, see Flores (1982).

12. *“El cual autor no pide a los que la leyeren... sino que le den el mismo crédito que suelen dar los discretos a los libros de caballería, que tan válidos andan en el mundo...”*  
(I, 52: 521)

Duffield:

“which author asks from those who read it... the same credit that the learned usually give to books of chivalry, which are of such rate and pitch in the world.”  
(p 416)

Ormsby:

“And the said author asks of those that shall read it nothing... save that they give him the same credit that people of sense<sup>1</sup> give to the books of chivalry that pervade the world and are so popular (...)”

<sup>1</sup> “NOTE C: One of his grievances against the books of chivalry being that they led astray not merely the silly, thoughtless, and uncritical, but vast numbers of people that ought to know better.”  
(p 384, note on p 389)

Watts:

“which author asks nothing of those who read it... but that they should give it as much credit as the judicious are wont to give to the books of chivalries, which are held of so much worth in the world.”  
(p 413)

The above quote appears in the final chapter of Part I, when the group have just returned from the second sally and discovered the lead box containing documents relating to the little-known third sally.<sup>177</sup> Despite the fact that the parchments contained within the box are entirely anachronistic, unlike all the other characters Don Quixote fails to see this, and as such this instance is a further example of irony of events as appeared in the eighth instance of irony analysed. In this type of irony there is no ironist and no character self-betrayal utilised in the execution of the irony; instead there is a shift in perspective from that of either the character or the narrator to the author. The result of this shift from specific to general comic irony from specific irony is that the emphasis is now less on the individuals encountered in Cervantes' story, and more on their wider world (Allen 2008: 153).

Norman Knox' revision of Muecke's theory of Cervantes' irony is crucial in understanding the significance of this shift. Whereas Muecke proposes a clear distinction between general irony, whose purpose is not normative or corrective but paradoxical, and specific irony, whose purpose is to expose deviations from the ironist's norms, (1969: 134) Knox argues that general irony can in fact do both. He bases this argument on the role of Providence, which he terms an irony "in which the appearance of disaster resolves itself into the reality of good fortune when deserved" (1972: 53). Of particular importance are the words "when deserved", as it indicates not only that good deeds can be rewarded by a higher power but also that bad deeds can be punished as well, thus creating an element of correction and normativity in the reader's interpretation of the novel.

The new author-driven stance is most reflected in Ormsby's translation, through his inclusion of a footnote. Watts' numerous lengthy footnotes which invade his translation throughout<sup>178</sup> usually offer only a very basic linguistic analysis or an attempt at an explanation of the cultural context of a particular word choice in the source text. Ormsby's, on the other hand, is much more useful as it equips his reader with additional information on Cervantes' literary tastes and opinions in a way which is consistent with the comments he lays out to the reader in the Preface to his translation. He states that when producing a translation there are two groups to whom the translator must cater – those who want to

---

<sup>177</sup> For a further exploration of the relationship between *Don Quixote* and the old romances of chivalry see Williamson (1984), and Riquer (1989: 90) for an analysis in particular of their significance at the close of Part I of the novel.

<sup>178</sup> As discussed in the fourth and fifth instances of irony analysed in this study.

see the original story, and those who want to see the translator's work (1885: viii) – and by providing the footnote he ensures he does just that. In the other two translations the average reader of *Don Quixote*, insofar as this is possible to define, would totally overlook the importance of the reference to intelligent and educated readers unless they already had a thorough understanding of Cervantes and his writing style. This is highly implausible for two reasons; namely because the first English biography of Cervantes had appeared only a century before in Smollett's translation, and so the relationship between him and his readers was still relatively new. Moreover, had there been a steady flow of translations produced since that point, assuming they would all have been accompanied by similar biographical resources, then readers would have been more likely to have been familiar with such in-depth issues as Cervantes' literary likes and dislikes. However, the fact that since Wilmot's version in 1774 there had been no further versions produced until Duffield's meant that this was not possible. As the only one of the three with a full-time professional background in translation<sup>179</sup>, Ormsby clearly would have known this level of detailed information about his author and considered the void in information significant enough to inform the reader himself.

Another factor at play, when it comes to explaining the variations between the three translations' word choices, is the influence of the "género editorial". As Víctor Infantes notes, this has been shaping the face of literature in Spain since the earliest days of the romances of chivalry (1989: 467-474), when literature became a commercial industry thanks to advances in technology and an expansion of the reading population. Despite Close's idealised assertion that "literature is the candid, unfiltered expression of the creator's real-life experience" (1978: 108), since the days of chivalric romances a work of literature has been much more than simply a story cultivated in the author's imagination and offered to his or her readers in written form. It has instead involved a third very powerful and influential party in the form of the publishers. According to Infantes, to overlook the commercial element of any work of literature is to forget that "son varias y múltiples las interferencias que se producen entre el impulso creativo y el balance específico que reciben —desprevenidamente— los lectores" (1989: 467). Therefore, for any

---

<sup>179</sup> Duffield worked in the mining trade in Latin America prior to writing his translation, learning Spanish along the way in Peru. According to the Preface to his translation, he first became familiar with *Don Quixote* in its Spanish form before reading any of the existing English versions (1881: xlii). Watts also worked in the mining industry in Australia, following an unsuccessful career in journalism.

work of literature to be a statistical success it must be commercially viable and thus to the publisher's taste, but this is particularly relevant for a novel as hugely successful and globally renowned as *Don Quixote*. This pressure contributes to an explanation of why the three nineteenth-century versions translated "*los discretos*" differently. On the basis that it contains the most footnotes, often to the detriment of the natural flow and enjoyment of the text, it is therefore Watts' translation which is the most scholarly in the strictest sense of the term. Meanwhile Duffield's and Ormsby's consciously forego the urge to explain every last detail contained within each sentence, for the sake of a pleasant reading experience. This argument is supported by the fact that theirs are more highly regarded than Watts' and have received more critical attention (especially Ormsby's). In line with this correlation, Duffield and Ormsby have picked up on an aspect of Cervantes' irony which Watts appears to have missed, visible in their use of "the learned", "people of sense" (respectively) and Watts' of "the judicious". The latter conveys the obviously intended connotation of wisdom and sound judgement<sup>180</sup> but only in its broader, more general sense. Duffield's and Ormsby's, in contrast, do still carry this level of meaning but also go beyond that to narrow it down, specifically referring to academic intelligence rather than general common sense. This had been the case since the very beginning of the nineteenth century, as Samuel Johnson's dictionary produced in collaboration with Henry James Todd in 1805 illustrates. Among their ten definitions for 'sense' are:

3. Perception of Intellect; apprehension of mind.
4. Sensibility; quickness or keenness of reception.
5. Understanding; soundness of faculties; strength of natural reason. (1805, Vol. IV)

Specific use of words like "intellect" and "faculties" clearly shows the involvement of more cerebral and academic aspects of the definition, as are present in Duffield's and Ormsby's translations, beyond the more common-sense or intuitive aspects recognised by Watts. Moreover, Ormsby's translation also incorporates a supplementary footnote. Unlike when Watts uses them, in this case Ormsby has successfully added more evidence as to how his translation should be interpreted in relation to the irony contained within it: he explicitly states that someone of sense is someone "who ought to know better" than to become "silly, thoughtless and uncritical". The most significant of these is the third adjective, as it links directly to the mention of faculties in the dictionary definition provided above.

---

<sup>180</sup> The *OED* defines 'judicious' as "having, showing, or done with good judgement or sense" (<http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/judicious?q=judicious>)

The effect of this is one of implied sarcasm, since it has already been made clear to the reader by this stage in the novel that Don Quixote's obsession with these old books of chivalry is in fact being parodied. It is through this sarcasm that Duffield and Ormsby underline the hypocrisy of confusing education with wisdom whereas, rather than attacking this hypocrisy, by amalgamating the two under one umbrella term Watts in fact perpetuates it.

Where the three nineteenth-century translations unanimously agree is in their recognition of the inverisimilitude of romances of chivalry as the target of the irony in this situation, as they also picked up on in the fourth instance of irony analysed in this study. Although the precise wording in this case varies, all three maintain the use of the present tense in the final clause of the above quote, which refers to the esteemed and highly regarded status allegedly enjoyed by chivalric romances according to this passage. By being so blatantly anachronistic, this passage forces the reader to acknowledge just how out of date romances of chivalry are and just how misaligned they are with Cervantean society's tastes. To an even later readership during the second half of the nineteenth century this effect would have been even more pronounced, as the genre disliked by Cervantes for being "over-decorative and ambiguous" in style (Yamada in Morera and Hanke 2005: 17) is even more distant and alien than it would have been to its more immediate descendants. As Close points out, although it was "justifiable in its original form, the order of chivalry gradually became irrelevant to society's needs with the rise of the modern state (...) Chivalric romances glamourized this late historical degeneration of chivalry" (1978: 70), and so to each successive generation of later readers this degree of irrelevance will only increase. Moreover, critics have continually noted the unavoidable relationship between the temporal context in which a literary work is received and the way in which it is received. Russell recognises that "Cervantes and his contemporaries had views about what was funny which differed in various respects from ours" (1969: 320); Ormsby laments in the Preface to his translation that later generations face a much more difficult task in translating, as earlier translators had an "inestimable advantage" due to the fact that "it cost him no dramatic effort to see things as Cervantes saw them" (1885: ii); and McGrath (2009: 78) supports Watts' view that "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" (1888: xvi). Johnson has pointed out, in relation to the reception of translations especially, that every source text "is about a time and place. Maybe that's not what is most interesting to us... but

it's a fact", going on to warn that "this important dimension is lost unless we can acquire some of the social context in which it was produced." (1990: 1) So, by retaining Cervantes' originally intended irony Duffield, Ormsby and Watts actually succeed in enhancing it and, given the even greater expanse of time passed between Cervantes' use of anachronism and readers today, even create an effect which is even more pronounced among twenty-first century readers than nineteenth.

13. *“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.”*

(II, *Prólogo*: 540)

Duffield:

“it is not for me to pursue any priest, especially if he holds in addition the title of the Holy Office; and if he said it for whom it would seem that he said it, I declare that he deceives himself absolutely; for I adore the genius of such a one, and wonder at works and his virtuous and long-continued labours...”

(Vol. II, p430)

Ormsby:

“...I am not likely to attack a priest, above all one if, in addition, he holds the rank of familiar of the Holy Office. And if he said what he did on account of him on whose behalf it seems he spoke, he is entirely mistaken; for I worship the genius of that person, and admire his works and unceasing and strenuous industry<sup>1</sup>.”

<sup>1</sup> Avellaneda, in his coarse and scurrilous preface, charged Cervantes with attacking Lope de Vega, obviously alluding to the passages on the drama in Part I, chapter xlviii, and attributed the attack to envy. Lope was not, however, a familiar of the Inquisition at the time Cervantes was writing the first part of *Don Quixote*, as the words used here would imply.”

(Vol. III, p 119)

Watts:

“I am not likely to persecute any ecclesiastic, above all, if he is a familiar of the Holy Office to boot<sup>1</sup>; and if he said what he did on account of him for whom he seemed to say it<sup>2</sup>, he is wholly mistaken, for I adore the man’s genius, admire his works and application, continuous and virtuous.”

<sup>1</sup> There is something very comical in Cervantes' disclaimer of any intention to persecute one of the familiars of the Inquisition – they being, as Hartzbusch remarks, rather more given to persecuting as to being persecuted.

<sup>2</sup> An allusion to the passage in Avellaneda's Prologue, where Cervantes is accused of having, through envy, spoken lightly of "one whom nations the most so justly honour, and to whom our own country owes so much for having maintained the theatres of Spain for so many years, *honestísima y fecundamente*, with his innumerable stupendous comedies, written with all the vigour of art which the word demands, and with the correctness and purity to be expected from a minister of the Holy Office." On referring to what is said of Lope's plays in Part I, C. xlviii, it will appear incredible that to anyone but Lope himself Cervantes' good-natured criticisms should give such deep offence."

(Vol. IV, p 7)

This instance of irony appears in the Prologue to the second part published in 1615, ten years after the first.<sup>181</sup> In the context of this study this quote is of particular significance, as it marks the emergence of a different kind of irony to that seen in the Prologue to Part I: unlike before, it is now very clearly aimed at specific individuals, namely Avellaneda as the "spurious" impostor responsible for the forged 1614 version of the second part of *Don Quixote* (Wilson 1948: 47), and Lope de Vega as Cervantes' primary literary rival.<sup>182</sup> Though the exact name of the publisher of Avellaneda's version is not confirmed, it is known that he was an Aragonese who was a big fan of Lope de Vega's work over Cervantes' (Eisenberg 1991: 119). In this passage Cervantes is defending himself, in the face of Avellaneda's allegations that he had criticised Lope de Vega's "displays of superficial erudition" (Eisenberg 1991: 123) in the Prologue to Part I. The original irony in Cervantes' source text exists in the form of a sarcastic jibe towards the hypocrisy which governed literary circles in early seventeenth-century Spain, which allowed for any amount of immoral and corrupt conduct in private as long as enough externally visible shows of literary ingratiation and exaggerated adherence to the expected professional norms were displayed. Despite having been formally ordained in 1614, Lope de Vega's life was "notoriously loose" (Riquer 1966: 536) and yet his works, all of which are accompanied at

---

<sup>181</sup> Castro (1941) and Rivers (1960) are two of the many critics who have studied the Prologue to the second part in detail.

<sup>182</sup> See Orozco Díaz (1992: 89-112) and Riley (1986: 44-46) for further exploration of the relationship between Cervantes and Lope de Vega.

the beginning by an endless string of notable literary figures and predecessors to whom that work is indebted, enjoyed a much greater critical reception than Cervantes' did among their contemporaries.<sup>183</sup>

What this background knowledge illustrates is how evidently it is Lope de Vega at whom Cervantes' ironic attack points. This effect increased even further by the fact that, despite this being so glaringly obvious to the reader, Cervantes still chooses to skirt so dramatically around the task of not naming Lope as to almost become comical. This is clear from his use of *por quien parece que lo dijo*. Sustaining this façade not only allows Cervantes to remain free from legitimate retaliation on Lope's part, but by going to such great lengths to do so conveys to the reader that Cervantes had no intention of concealing his anger towards his rival, and wanted all those who read his Prologue to know it.

Aside from the specific targets of the irony in the second part's Prologue compared to the first, the other main features of the newly emerging brand of irony at this stage is the consolidation of the fact that Don Quixote, regardless of any earlier inconclusive debate, is now most definitely not an ingénue whatsoever, unless this could somehow be in conjunction with being a "conscious ironist" simultaneously (Allen 2008: 161). Secondly, by the second part Allen further notes that there is an established role distribution in relation to how the irony is executed; whereas Don Quixote and Sancho previously found themselves at times the ironist, the victim or the object of Cervantes' irony this is now no longer the case in the same way. Instead, both Don Quixote and Sancho Panza by the arrival of Part II "have become accomplished ironists, and the knight's antagonists have become the victims and targets not only of the irony of the two protagonists but also the Irony of Events" (2008: 183). The acknowledgement of this shift is of fundamental importance in understanding irony in *Don Quixote*, as it signals an important stage in Don Quixote's (and Sancho's, in comparison) character evolution away from the misguided and deluded fool towards the more insightful, reflective and admirable protagonist the reader finds on his deathbed at the end of the novel.

One characteristic shared by each of the nineteenth-century translations is their continuation of the almost farcical extent of the avoidance of naming either the religious professional whom the narrator is accused of attacking, or the person who raises such charges on their behalf. Due to syntactic differences between the source language and the

---

<sup>183</sup> For an in-depth analysis of the stormy relationship between Lope de Vega and Cervantes, see Eisenberg (1991)

target language this comic effect is in fact even greater in the translations than in the original. The short phrase beginning “and if he said...” which binds the beginning and the end of the passage together contains the pronoun “he” at least twice, even three times in Ormsby’s and Watts’ case, and all three versions contain both the present tense and the preterite tense of the verb “say”. Such a level of repetition in such a short clause, particularly one that is not regulated by any punctuation, creates a rambling and almost tongue-twisting effect, especially if read at any speed. This linguistic device further adds to the humour already present in the content of the passage. In Duffield’s and Watts’ version the fact that this clause follows a semi-colon, and not a full stop as in Ormsby’s, means the entire quote consists of just one long sentence. Furthermore, the way that this passage consists of several short and often subordinate clauses indicates just how fervently the narrator is ensuring he does not leave himself open to any reprisal for his remarks. This is particularly relevant in relation to the addition of the reference to holding the title of the Holy Office tacked onto the end of the first statement, and the final phrase where the narrator declares his undying admiration for the supposedly unnamed individual. The passage would in fact read much more smoothly and fluidly without these insertions, as if they were added retrospectively by the author. The fact that all three nineteenth-century versions retained this defensive flattery, both in terms of the vocabulary and the structure, indicates that all three translators detected this irony and also recognised the significance of it. The version which most effectively conveys this irony is Ormsby’s, with his use of “worship” when describing his feelings for Lope’s work over the other two versions’ “adore”. Although the latter clearly conveys the depth of the narrator’s regard for the subject’s “genius”, the former also carries this same meaning and a sarcastic undertone in addition. In a nod to Lope’s position as a member of the clergy, something Cervantes clearly regards as ridiculous and undeserved, Ormsby is again highlighting the vast contradiction between the real Lope and the Lope who the rest of society saw, and in doing so he illustrates the extent of what was by then in 1615 the bad relations between Cervantes and him.

The use of footnotes is a theme which has featured throughout my analysis, and this particular quote gives the best examples so far of the problems in relation to this issue. In the paratexts accompanying their translations, each of the nineteenth-century translators names his target readers. Duffield offers his version to everyone, as a means to “enable all classes of reader to see the Ingenious Knight through a clean glass” (1881: xlii),

which would suggest that his is the least scholarly of the three versions and this is consistent with the fact that out of the three his carries the fewest footnotes. Ormsby does not explicitly state who he is aiming his version at, but he does note that it is aimed more at those interested in stylistic features of a translation than simply the story itself (1885: 8). This suggests that his is aimed at those who are already familiar with the story of *Don Quixote*, and also with translation theory. This fits in line with the fact that Ormsby was the only one of the three who came from a professional background in translation. Watts appears to contradict himself between his prefatory comments and his finished version. He states that, unlike Duffield's, his translation is aimed at "those not absolutely ignorant of Spanish" and this is why he apparently avoids giving too many "overt instructions" to the reader (1888: vi). In reality, his version is the one that forces upon the reader a barrage of footnotes in an attempt to explain every last detail but often overlooking the most important ones, as previously noted in his treatment of the reference to the *Universidades Menores* and as is also the case here.

Despite the difference in target readers, all three versions were aimed at those with at least some basic knowledge of, or, in the case of Duffield's version at least an interest in, Spanish literature. Beyond that it would be unrealistic to expect readers to be aware of the tumultuous relationship between Cervantes and Lope de Vega, and so in Duffield's version the skilfully retained irony detailed above is lost on the majority of his readers. As in previous cases, it is Ormsby's whose translation of irony is the most effective whilst, also as in previous cases, Watts' is the least effective. In his footnote, in just two sentences Ormsby manages to inform the reader of all the information referred to in Watts', even including some additional facts (for example, that Lope was not yet a familiar of the Inquisition at the time that Cervantes would have been writing Part I). The effect of this is that it sufficiently equips the reader with the information required to fully appreciate the irony previously invisible to them, whilst simultaneously remaining concise and relevant enough as to avoid distracting the reader from the actual story. In contrast, true to form Watts provides not one but two footnotes with his version. The problem with the first of these is that, given what Ormsby points out about timing, it is incorrect and therefore obsolete. In the second, instead of simply noting that Avellaneda attacked Cervantes in the prologue to his 1614 version in the second note Watts spends seven lines quoting it unnecessarily. The damaging effect of this is that by overloading the reader with too much detail Watts loses the subtlety of the original irony and in his version it becomes something new altogether.

14. *“No hay para qué, señor – respondió Sancho – tomar venganza de nadie, pues no es de buenos cristianos tomarla de los agravios (...)*

*–Pues ésa es tu determinación – replicó don Quijote – Sancho bueno, Sancho discreto, Sancho Cristiano y Sancho sincero, dejemos estas fantasmas...”*

(II, 11: 617-18)

Duffield:

“There is no need, sir’, answered Sancho, ‘to take vengeance on anybody, nor does it belong to good Christians to take revenge for injuries...’

‘Since this, then, is thy resolve’, answered Don Quixote, ‘good Sancho, Sancho the discreet, Christian Sancho, and Sancho the sincere, leave we these fantastical shapes...’”

(pp. 568-9)

Ormsby:

“There is no occasion to take vengeance on anyone, señor’, replied Sancho; ‘for it is not the part of good Christians to go avenge wrongs...’

‘Well,’ said Don Quixote, ‘if that be thy determination, good Sancho, sensible Sancho, Christian Sancho, honest Sancho, let us leave these phantoms alone...’”

(p 119)

Watts:

“There is no call, sir,” said Sancho, “to take vengeance on anyone, for it is not the part of a good Christian to take it for wrongs.”

“Since that is thy determination,” replied Don Quixote “good Sancho, discreet Sancho, Christian Sancho, guileless Sancho, let us leave these phantoms...”

(p 136)

This conversation between Sancho and Don Quixote occurs during the third sally in the chapter in which Cervantes’ knight attempts to avenge the wrong done by a group of actors they meet on the road, whom he mistakes for knights, after they take Sancho’s

donkey and use him to imitate Don Quixote on Rocinante. After Sancho has talked his master out of taking on the group, the men return the donkey unharmed and continue on their journey. By the second part of *Don Quixote*, unlike in the first, the other characters no longer feign agreement with the protagonist in his madness and at the same time he is in turn now much less susceptible to their tricks. He builds on the man portrayed in the previous instances and is now a much more conscious ironist, fully aware of the hypocrisy underlying the others' apparently noble motives.<sup>184</sup> An additionally significant feature on top of this contrast is that by the third sally the theme of religious faith takes centre stage. In this particular instance, Don Quixote at first appears a hypocrite who is ironically portrayed to the reader as one who "ends up only slightly superior to the flagrant sinner" (Allen 2008: 168) as a result of his intentions. However, by inciting Sancho to seek vengeance through physically attacking the group of actors, who have only temporarily commandeered his horse and not actually stolen it, through Don Quixote's words he is in fact highlighting the lack of such negative qualities in his squire. Instead of acting on his master's instructions and attacking the group, Sancho takes the higher moral ground and as a result emerges in a much better light in the eyes of the reader than if he had challenged the men to an unnecessary duel.

This is unlikely to have been unintentional on Cervantes' part, given the focus of his irony on religious beliefs and the closely linked issue of right and wrong: Don Quixote could simply have instructed Sancho directly to refrain from stooping to unnecessary violence and not attack the group of men, though this would only have been a partial success in the transformation already well underway by now of the main character, from a deluded fool obsessed with outdated ideals to a noble character worthy of respect and admiration. On one hand, it would have achieved the same end as is achieved via the author's chosen means, in that Sancho would not have attacked the actors. On the other hand, however, by missing out the somewhat hidden stage in Sancho's decision making process, such a

---

<sup>184</sup> Some critics disagree that such a level of transformation is already underway at this stage in the second part and Don Quixote is not as in control of the irony around him, although such a view suggests too literal interpretation of the knight's words to his squire (Cf. Close 1973b: 355; El Saffar 1980: 237-254). A comparison of Don Quixote as an ironist in Part I with that of Part II clearly shows him to be an unconscious ironist initially; this is illustrated in the episode involving Sanson Carrasco's performance as the alleged Knight of the Mirrors. By winning what can only be described as a fluke victory over him Don Quixote succeeds in teaching the other characters a lesson, or, carrying the author's ironic message, as a direct result of being the butt of their pranks and without even realising it. There are still occasions in Part II where Don Quixote is an unconscious ironist, though these are less frequent (Johnson 1990: 66).

scenario would have been entirely devoid of any of the subtlety for which Cervantes' irony is renowned.<sup>185</sup> In fact, as Wilson has noted, the irony of the second part of *Don Quixote* was even more subtly executed than in the first, although this was often overlooked by early critics because "first impressions are often strong; many readers of that day probably read the second part without seeing much more in it than they had in its forerunner" (1948: 34).

The technique used by Cervantes to execute this subtle irony is his use of layering of adjectives used to describe Sancho Panza, starting with *bueno*, advancing to *discreto*, then *Cristiano* and finally *sincere*. Allen notes that the latter, "constitutes the climax" (2008: 169) and thus how each of the nineteenth-century translators has translated these is of fundamental importance. Should the reader have missed the irony hidden behind the first description of Sancho, this is reiterated three times and layered with increasing force on each occasion, until it becomes clear that Don Quixote is wholeheartedly supportive of Sancho's decision and offers yet more proof that he has shed all traces of the naïve ingénue seen previously. Not only is he now aware of the irony, but he is also the one consciously executing it.

Furthermore, Don Quixote is also questioning the legitimacy of the socially constructed expectation that one should in fact respond to a situation of physical force with more of the same, in conjunction not only with the norms of chivalry but also with the emerging theme of religious beliefs which Cervantes questioningly explores in this third sally. Although the *Old Testament* advocates righting wrongs by means of "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a hand for a hand, a foot for a foot" (Exodus 21:24), in the very earliest stages of the *New Testament* this is contradicted when the disciple Matthew first reminds people of that earlier maxim before then immediately adding, "But I say to you, That you resist not evil: but whoever shall smite you on your right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Matthew 5: 38-39). The Don Quixote of Part I would undoubtedly have meant it when he urged Sancho to seek vengeance, and in this biblical context Part I therefore becomes the knight's own 'Old Testament'. By the third sally in Part II, the knight's New Testament, a parallel re-birth and resurrection of the protagonist, has now begun and he is beginning to manifest an increasingly different outlook on the world to before.

---

<sup>185</sup> Close notes that "Cervantes keeps his allusions muffled" (1978: 248); De Bruyn cites Saint-Évremond when he refers to "the full extent of Cervantes' subtle and pervasive irony" (2009: 23).

In this case, there is very little difference between the three nineteenth-century translators in terms of their effective and successful retention of the original irony. All agreed in their choice of “good” for the first adjective and, although they differed on the second, any significance that this bears on the meaning of the sentence is negligible. As has so often been the case in previous passages analysed in this study, Watts replicates Duffield’s choice. This suggests that the pair were still collaborating on their joint translation at this stage, although the exact date at which they went their separate ways is not known. Again, as on so many previous occasions, Ormsby’s version differs from both and he has opted for an alternative translation of *discreto* in the form of “sensible”. Given that the English meaning of discreet is to be “unintentionally intrusive; careful and prudent... especially to avoid embarrassment”<sup>186</sup>, while an action that is sensible is one “done or chosen in accordance with wisdom or prudence”,<sup>187</sup> both translations indicate that Sancho is acting wisely and, as both definitions indicate, prudently in his method of resolving the situation. More importantly, both translations also sustain the fact that Don Quixote supports and agrees with his strategy.

A further variation between the translations, but one on which all three differ, is their handling of the fourth and most forceful adjective in Don Quixote’s description of Sancho. Duffield directly glosses the term used in the source text, which he had sufficient knowledge of the Spanish language to enable him to execute efficiently and selectively.<sup>188</sup> With both the English and the Spanish stemming from the sixteenth-century Latin *sincerus*, denoting clarity or purity, Duffield’s final description of Sancho denotes actions “free from pretence or deceit; proceeding from genuine feelings”<sup>189</sup>. This mirrors perfectly Cervantes’ own description of the same as “con sinceridad... libre de fingimiento”<sup>190</sup>. As before, despite using slight alternatives in their subsequent versions, both Ormsby’s “honest” and Watts’ “guileless” retain equally the sense of acting without falseness or ulterior motives.

In fact, the only significant difference among the three translations is in the word order of this final part of Don Quixote’s mode of addressing his squire, and contrary to the predominant trend by now emerging in this study it is not Ormsby whose version narrowly

<sup>186</sup> <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/discreet?q=discreet>

<sup>187</sup> <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/sensible?q=sensible>

<sup>188</sup> See his handling of “contravene” in the first instance of irony analysed, his decision to avoid glossing *cura* in the fifth, and his use of “glory” in the tenth for further evidence of his command of Spanish, albeit lesser than Ormsby’s.

<sup>189</sup> <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/sincere?q=sincere>

<sup>190</sup> <http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=sincero>

defeats the other two in successfully retaining either Cervantes' irony or the fact that *Don Quixote* lends itself to a Romantic interpretation, but Duffield. Ormsby and Watts continue the structural repetition created by placing the adjective before the squire's name, in accordance with English syntactical norms, and in much the same way as Cervantes adhered to the parallel equivalent Spanish-language expectations, and placed them after. But, by calling him "Sancho the sincere" Duffield in fact artificially creates both irony and Romanticism which were not there before. This title which Don Quixote gives him is reminiscent of those attributed to knights of old in the chivalric romances upon which the knight used to gorge, and it is known that English readers were to some degree already familiar with translations of works such as *Tirant lo Blanch* (1490), *Lancelot, le Chevalier de la Charrette* (c.1170), and the English romance *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (c.1375-1400). Readers of Duffield's translation therefore cannot help but instinctively view Sancho in this situation from a knight-like perspective when they read Don Quixote's words, a much more elevated standing than his usual rank of squire. This is significant, insofar as it implies that Sancho now possesses at least some if by no means all of the qualities demanded by the traditional chivalric code of honour, such as prudence, truth, valour and sagacity.<sup>191</sup> This view is shared by Martínez Mata who describes all of the characters in Cervantes' novel as "hybrid", having noted that "there is more to them than initially meets the eye, and their conduct must be seen in the conduct of their circumstances." (2008: 100). Moreover, what is even more notable is that the attribution of the outdated chivalric persona comes from Don Quixote. In doing so it subtly reminds the reader that despite having come a long way in his character evolution to date, Don Quixote has still not quite yet severed all ties with his beloved romances of chivalry.

---

<sup>191</sup> For further analysis of the "Quixotisation of Sancho and the Sanchification of Don Quixote" see Allen (2008: 95-97), as well as Madariaga (1961).

15. *“cuya amistad del Rocinante fue tan única y tan trabada, que hay fama, por tradición de padres a hijo...”*

(II, 12: 620)

Duffield:

“...whose friendship for Rozinante was so unique and binding, that there is a rumour, by tradition from father to son...”

(p 575)

Ormsby:

“between whom and Rocinante there was a friendship so unequalled and so strong, that it is handed down by tradition from father to son...”

(p 124)

Watts:

“whose friendship for Rozinante was so singular and so close that there is a tradition handed down from father to son...”

(p 138)

This sentence occurs in the middle of Part II, when Don Quixote and Sancho have stopped to spend the night sleeping in a grove. The most obvious manifestation of irony here is a further example of the confusion between pseudo-historicity and verisimilitude, and also as a repetition of the falseness which belies a distinction between class and worth.<sup>192</sup> The irony here is stable, as its target has been a target of Cervantes’ irony throughout the novel and the author’s ironic intention therefore clear to the reader (Booth 1974: 3).<sup>193</sup> Cervantes is forcibly presenting the reader with a reminder of just how

---

<sup>192</sup> See El Saffar (1968) and Wardropper (1965) for fuller exploration of the reliability of truth and the various narrators in *Don Quixote*.

<sup>193</sup> A similar example of this is the fourth instance analysed, in which the narrator questions the accuracy of Don Quixote’s name and lineage, therefore calling into question the validity of the entire

antiquated and incongruous with contemporary society those traditional chivalric traits and features are. This is executed through the narrative, which cannot possibly have been handed down from father to son yet as no subsequent generations have passed since the story is being told, and so the reader automatically converts this outdated ridiculousness to chivalric features in general.

Part II of *Don Quixote* displays a greater number of examples of this contrast between historical accuracy and plausibility than the first part (Allen 2008: 178), and the reason for this is that as more time passes and chivalric romances become less and less believable for readers, Don Quixote likewise seems to begin to recognise this. The ever more jarring disparity therefore serves as an increasing indication of Don Quixote's own transition away from his earlier 'madness' and towards the more enlightened and societally acceptable man he is by the end of the novel on his deathbed. This shift in the reader's view of Don Quixote more towards sympathy and understanding, despite there only being one month's worth of plot time elapsed between the two parts, is evoked by one of Cervantes' main strategies of irony directed predominantly at the vice itself and less at the hapless individual who succumbs to it (Allen 2008: 166). On that basis, the reader realises that it was in fact never Don Quixote who unintentionally advocated the books of chivalry and their values to those he met along the way on his travels, but the narrator, who did so knowingly.

The second wider social theme ironically attacked in this particular instance is that of the mutual exclusion of lower social class and greater moral worth, though the execution of this irony is more subtle than the above anachronism. Horses serve as important symbols throughout the novel, not only as companions to their masters but also on a more basic level having provided the transport which facilitated the numerous adventures and journeys. On this occasion, however, the importance of the horses' friendship with each other is acknowledged too, creating a parallel resource for Cervantes through which he can project his reflections on and criticisms of mankind. Here, that reflection is that, despite belonging to masters from extremely different walks of financial life, the two horses nevertheless maintain a warm and enduring bond with each other without any form of condescension or hierarchy. Cervantes therefore illustrates via the animals that the

---

story; in the twelfth the narrator implies that works of chivalric literature are still highly regarded among contemporary readers.

relationship between monetary and moral substance is not automatic, and can at times even be entirely irrelevant.

For the second time in this study, this feature of Cervantes' irony is one retained equally by all three of the nineteenth-century translators.<sup>194</sup> All three use personification here in their description of the closeness of the friendship between the two, just as in the source text, and this anthropomorphism is crucial as it is this that bridges the gap between the horses and the humans, thus enabling the transfer of Cervantes' ironic reflection from one to the other. This uniform consistency is indicative in itself of how strongly each translator perceived Cervantes' original message to have been; unlike on previous occasions, where ironic references to the confusion of the moral and the monetary have varied in their translations.<sup>195</sup> Likewise, all three translations also each retain the notion of a "tradition" being passed "from father to son", a further degree of similarity which is again not present in any other phrases analysed so far. The former is crucial in accentuating the latter, as it implies that the story has not only been passed on between generations but has done so several times, a "long-established custom or belief that has been passed on from one generation to another".<sup>196</sup> The result of this accentuation is an increase in the ironic effect, and so all of the nineteenth-century versions have conserved an equally high level of irony from the original as each other.

In fact, one of the only notable discrepancies among the translations in this case is in the adjectives used to describe the depth of the friendship between Dapple and Rocinante. Once again the familiar pattern emerges, whereby Duffield's and Ormsby's translations retain the irony the most effectively, while Watts' is the least successful. Duffield's decision to opt for a direct gloss and use "unique" is by far the safest option, and Ormsby's choice of "unequaled" is a perfect synonym according to the *DRAE*.<sup>197</sup> The use of "singular" in Watts' version admittedly does retain the concept of the friendship between

---

<sup>194</sup> Despite this also being the case in the seventh instance of irony analysed, this shared approach was not sustained throughout the eighth to the fifteenth instances. This indicates that the three translators all started out with varying awareness and understanding of Cervantes' irony, and gradually converged towards their own consistent individual translation strategy as they got to know both the text and its author more closely.

<sup>195</sup> Cf. the eighth instance of irony analysed in this study for evidence of variation and disagreement among the three translators, as well as the next instance following this one for further evidence of how this irony has become more pronounced as the novel progresses, reflecting Don Quixote's increased self-awareness and enlightenment.

<sup>196</sup> <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/tradition?q=tradition>

<sup>197</sup> The *DRAE* defines Ormsby's adjective as meaning "que no tiene igual", which perfectly supports the definition of Duffield's gloss as "solo y sin otro de su especie".

the horses being like no other, which is supported by the fact that the second definition of “única” provided by the *DRAE* as “singular (extraordinario; excelente)”. However, this term can also carry connotations of being like no other due to negative characteristics, implying more of a sense of being strange than being unique in a positive sense. There is no entry for “única” in the *Tesoro*, but it is nevertheless clear that the ambiguity created by Watts’ version dilutes the ironic effect of Cervantes’ original reflection discussed above.

Relatively speaking, this variation in their use of adjectives does little to take away from the fact that, for the first time, each of the translators spotted and retained the principal element of Cervantes’ irony. The only other significant difference is Duffield’s retention of the suggestion of a rumour surrounding the generational transmission of the story, while the two later versions have chosen to omit this. The significance of these words is that they add an even greater suggestion of doubt and uncertainty around the passing of the story down orally between generations, whereby Duffield still informs the reader of the purported tradition but absolves himself in advance of any responsibility for the assertion. This reflects perfectly Allen’s use of the phrase “*pseudohistoricity*” (2008: 139, 178; my emphasis), and as this poorly concealed doubt in his own words is also voiced by the narrator in Cervantes’ original, Duffield’s irony is therefore more obviously laid out before the reader. Moreover, this is achieved not only through the inclusion of the clause “that there is rumour” but also by the syntax used to frame it. By separating the short phrase from the rest of the sentence with a comma at either end, Duffield has created a jarring effect on the natural flow of the sentence, signalling clearly to the reader that these words have been intentionally added in for a specific purpose.<sup>198</sup> Ormsby’s and Watts’ versions, on the other hand, leave the reader to carry out more of the deduction work themselves.

Duffield’s version is not only the one of the three to most effectively retain Cervantes’ irony in this instance, but it is also the translation which most lends itself to a Romantic interpretation of Cervantes’ protagonist and his tale at this stage. The portrayal of the old romances of chivalry, or aspects associated with them, such as the verbal tradition of passing on legends, in an increasingly doubtful and dubious light parallels the relinquishing of Don Quixote’s own steadfast faith in them as the novel progresses. The subtlety of this particular ironic effect is yet another example of Cervantes’ signature technique: by using only the narrator’s voice in the entire paragraph containing this phrase,

---

<sup>198</sup> This verbosity as a means of shielding himself from reprisal is similar to the strategy retained by all three of the translators in the thirteenth instance analysed in this study.

as well as the one immediately before and after, the long monologue created leaves the reader unable to know for certain where the protagonist's views on chivalric romances currently stand precisely and instead they are left to decide for themselves. However, both the extent and also the frequency of the intentional vagueness and subtlety in the irony deployed by Cervantes has been acknowledged already in this study, and therefore this probable causal relationship is too significant to overlook.

16. "El pobre honrado, si es que puede ser honrado el pobre..."

(II, 22: 694)

Duffield:

"The poor, honest man (if the poor can be honest)..."  
(Vol. III, p122)

Ormsby:

"The poor man is a man of honour (if indeed a poor man can be a man of honour)..."  
(Vol. IV, p237)

Watts:

"The poor, honourable man, he said, (if it is possible for the poor man to be honourable<sup>1</sup>)..."

<sup>1</sup> The same piece of irony appeared before in Chapter vii of the First Part"

This instance of irony, which appears to mirror an earlier quote analysed,<sup>199</sup> comes from the middle of the second part of *Don Quixote* during the third sally. Don Quixote and Sancho have just set off for Montesinos' cave with Basilio, discussing romantic love and what it means for a poor man to find himself the lover of a woman much more beautiful than him. The marked, almost word-for-word similarity to the earlier appearance of this reference to the suggested relationship between money and honour, is far from unintentional by Cervantes. In fact, the latter is an intentional reiteration of the author's attack on the confusion between the moral and the monetary which was so prevalent among his contemporary society.<sup>200</sup> It is repeated here following its first appearance in (I: vii) in order to further accentuate to the reader just how strongly Cervantes disagreed with the suggestion that the two must go hand in hand. The second key feature of the irony contained within this quote in the source text, is the repeated confirmation to the reader

---

<sup>199</sup> The earlier version of this remark made reference to an "hombre de bien – si es que este título se puede dar al que es pobre" (I, 7: 104); it is the eighth unit of analysis in this study.

<sup>200</sup> See Allen (2008); Crocker (1951); and Jaksić (1994) for a general consideration of this discussion between the moral and the monetary.

once and for all that Don Quixote is by this point in the novel no longer an ingénue, but by now a conscious ironist “extremely adept at exposing the follies of others” (Allen 2008: 167). This, therefore, also means that he should no longer be viewed as entirely mad or crazy, since Cervantes now directs his reader away from blaming the individual who falls victim to vice and towards blaming the vice itself. This same illustration of the fact that Don Quixote is no longer an ingénue, if indeed he ever were, has been made in the two previous instances analysed. The fact that Cervantes felt it necessary to reiterate the point so forcibly shows just how clear his intention was to strongly emphasise the fact that his protagonist’s character transition is by now well underway. By lifting the responsibility for resisting vice from the individual, the author in the second part absolves Don Quixote from any associated blame surrounding vices, such as this kind of hypocrisy, and this in turn helps contribute to an increasingly more sentimental view of the protagonist as the novel progresses. This shift away from writing Don Quixote off as mad or foolish is in fact one of the most pronounced differences between the second part and the first; a view supported by Allen, who describes this turn as an “important component of the movement towards sanity” (ibid) and what Johnson has compared to “an ironic meditation on what had happened to Humanism in the preceding hundred years. The new learning had become old” (1990:16). Although there appears to be the same pretended doubt as before, the crucial difference is that this time Don Quixote is in a position and state of mind to say these as his own words rather than them coming via the narrator.

As far as the three translations are concerned, Ormsby’s justifies the reputation of his translation as the best in the nineteenth century<sup>201</sup> by showing that he has picked up on Cervantes’ original irony and retained it fully. This is evident in the way he converts the first clause of the above quote into a definitive statement, emphatically informing the reader that the poor man is indeed a man of honour and removing any doubt around the issue, only to then undermine the validity of what he has just stated by what follows in parenthesis. By listing two completely opposing statements in immediate juxtaposition like that highlights to the reader that it is absolutely not the case that the former is believed to be true by wider society. By not including a conjugated verb, Duffield’s and Watts’ do not appear as emphatic description. As a result, the degree of satire is not as great, and therefore the original irony has been less effectively conveyed to their readers.

---

<sup>201</sup> Ardila 2009a: 23; Mayo & Ardila in Ardila 2009a: 57; Pardo 2011: 382 all argue in favour of Ormsby’s, and the trends which have emerged so far in this study appear to support their view.

Where Duffield's regains some of the irony is in his use of "the poor" within his parentheses, instead of restricting his aspersion to "the poor man" as Watts did. By referring not to an individual but to "the poor" as a whole, this is a noticeable deviation from the source text, which specifically mentions the "*hombre pobre*" (my emphasis). The effect of Duffield's chosen technique is that it makes the ridiculousness of the bigoted confusion he is attacking seem even more narrow-minded and blinkered than before, as it passes the same sweeping generalisation over every person who might fall into the category of poverty. Moreover, whilst it might be argued that this is merely a reflection of Duffield's own linguistic style and is not the product of anywhere near that much premeditation, the fact that immediately prior to this in the first clause of the above quote he does stipulate "the poor *man*" (my emphasis) renders such a theory unlikely.

As on so many previous occasions, Watts' version so ineffectively transmits the irony present in Cervantes' original that it raises the question of whether he even noticed it at all. His overuse of footnotes once again causes the same problem here for the reader as it did during his earlier translation of the reference made to the fact that the priest was a graduate of the University of Sigüenza.<sup>202</sup> Once again, by inserting a footnote, Watts interrupts the flow of the narrative and draws the reader's attention away from an irony which has already been widely recognised as being extremely subtle and at times easy to miss even without distraction.<sup>203</sup> Had his handling of this similar irony in the earlier instance been effective, he would not have to flag it up so visibly to his readers here as they would already have spotted the repetition. Watts also states that the "same" piece of irony appeared earlier in the novel, but the irony present here is in reality much more evolved than that of Part I. This strongly suggests that Watts has only recognised one of the two ironies present here: the first is the perpetuation of Cervantes' attack on the confusion of the moral and the monetary, reiterated here to reinforce his initial point of view, and this much has indeed been perceived by Watts. However, what his translation appears to overlook altogether is the significance of this second appearance of a reference to material wealth, and moral honour, being symbiotically linked to Don Quixote's character evolution

---

<sup>202</sup> Cf. the fifth unit of analysis in this study for Watts' misleading and ineffective handling of Cervantes' irony through his use of supplementary footnotes.

<sup>203</sup> Close describes Cervantes' irony as "elegantly disguised" (1978: 247) as well as "imperceptible" (ibid: 248); Ormsby himself recognises that Cervantes' irony as "comedy as subtle as Shakespeare's or Molière's" (Vol. I 1885: 76); and De Bruyn echoes Saint-Évremond's seventeenth-century acknowledgement of "the full extent of Cervantes' subtle and pervasive irony" (in Ardila 2009a: 23).

as he progresses towards sanity and enlightenment. This transformation was not yet underway the first time around, as the protagonist was still intended by his author to be viewed by readers as being a mad fool, but by this stage in the novel the situation is very different. Thus, by suggesting that this second instance is the same as the first, Watts gives the impression that the intended transformation of Don Quixote's character present in Cervantes' original version, detected by the other two nineteenth-century translators, is lost altogether in his.

This absence of progress in the transformation from mad fool to noble hero also means that it is Watts' version which lends itself least to a Romantic interpretation of Don Quixote's character. His sanity is central to a romantic interpretation of his character, because in order for him to successfully complete his metamorphosis into the wise, self-aware and rational man we encounter on his deathbed at the end of the novel, newly ennobled and worthy of respect in the reader's eyes, this picture of him must first be introduced to the reader before it can be consolidated. By overlooking this altogether, Watts leaves his readers in a position where will not be as well prepared to meet this later Don Quixote, whereas Duffield's and Ormsby's readers will already be mindful of him.

17. *"...aunque el duque mi señor lo sabe, porque yo me he quejado a él, no una, sino muchas veces, y pedídale mande que el tal Labrador se case con mi hija, hace orejas de mercader y apenas quiere oírme; y es la causa que, como el padre del burlador es tan rico y le presta dineros, y le sale por fiador de sus trampas por momentos, no le quiere descontentar ni dar pesadumbre en ningún modo."*

(II, 38: 873)

Duffield:

"...and although the Duke my lord knows – because I have complained to him, not once, but many times, and begged him to make that farmer marry my daughter – yet he turns a deaf ear, and will scarcely listen to me. And the cause is that the father of this mocker is very rich, and lends him money, and stands his surety in all his fooling at every moment, and he has no wish to make him unhappy or give him trouble for anything, in any way."

(p 434)

Ormsby:

"And though my lord the Duke is aware of it (for I have complained to him, not once but many and many a time, and entreated him to order the farmer to marry my daughter), he turns a deaf ear and will scarcely listen to me; the reason being that as the deceiver's father is so rich, and lends him money, and is constantly going security for his debts, he does not like to offend or annoy him in any way."

(p 99)

Watts:

"...and though the Duke my master knows it, because I have complained to him not once but many times, and prayed him to bid the said farmer to marry my daughter, he turns a deaf ear and will scarcely listen to me. And the reason is, because the father of this joker is rich and lends him money and goes surety for his pranks at every moment, he will not displease him nor trouble him in any way."

(p 119)

The above quote appears when Doña Rodríguez appeals to Don Quixote for help in getting the Duke to encourage the farmer's son, who has left her daughter pregnant, to marry her. As a result of her story the Duke sinks in the reader's estimation for two reasons; firstly, his distinctly unchivalrous refusal to help restore the honour of the young woman, and secondly, the fact that the reason for his refusal is his selfish desire to protect his own needs above anyone else's.<sup>204</sup>

The significance of this quote, in relation to the role of irony in the source text as a whole, is that it provides one of the examples of the characters who were previously targeting and mocking Don Quixote, making him the victim and object of irony for their own entertainment, now find the situation reversed and they themselves are the victim.<sup>205</sup> As Allen puts it, the knight's "principal antagonists" have become the "tricksters tricked" (2008: 180), and in this case the Duke represents all of the characters who have been guilty of such behaviour towards the protagonist. The cause of this turn of events is Don Quixote's unwavering faith in Providence which, unlike before, now appears to be not so naïve and 'mad' after all: not only is the Duke now the object of Cervantes' irony in his own right as an individual character and group representative, but also as a clear manifestation of the confusion between the moral and the monetary which is offered up for scrutiny once more by Cervantes. The fact that Doña Rodríguez approached the Duke for help in the first place, reflects the fact that the community would have automatically looked on him as a moral figurehead and leader, and yet as the one with apparently the most wealth and influence he is the most reluctant to help.<sup>206</sup> In contrast, the knight with only a dwindling estate and almost no material wealth left, is apparently the only person willing to come to her aid. A further attack on this confusion is the fact that, underneath it all, despite his rank the Duke actually has very little money left and as a result is heavily reliant on a man who seems in no rush to punish his own son's behaviour which has been far from honourable or moral. It can therefore be argued that in this instance it is the traditional order of social

---

<sup>204</sup> Marianella (1979) devotes an entire book to the analysis of this particular episode and an exploration of Cervantes' treatment of *dueñas* and *doncellas*, though the focus of her book is not on irony in particular. Fernández & Rodríguez (1987) have also conducted a similar study.

<sup>205</sup> Aside from the Duke, other characters in this category also include Sanson Carrasco, Altisadora and the Duchess (Cf. Allen 2008: 180). Since this particular irony of events is executed the same way in all four cases by Cervantes, it is sufficient to analyse only one in detail.

<sup>206</sup> Johnson outlines the links between Duke's power, the wealth which affords him this power and the land which generates him this wealth. She describes Aragón where the episode is set as "the most resolutely feudal region of Spain" in Cervantes' day (1990: 18).

hierarchies which is being attacked by Cervantes. Marianella highlights the link between this fictional episode and the harsh reality of life for women in Cervantes' day, when she remarks that in this instance of irony "the theme of seduction and abandonment is focused from the perspective of uncompromising verisimilitude" (1979: 111), a verisimilitude which reflects the fact that "it is quite evident that continued economic security concerns the Duke more than justice" (1979: 138). However, this criticism is not levelled at unjust social hierarchies in their conventional form and instead they are subverted in that it is in fact a non-aristocratic member of society, the wealthy farmer, who owns more money than the Duke. By trying to force the Duke, Don Quixote is trying to restore the traditional system for righting wrongs and, when the Duke accepts his challenge, it appears that he has been successful in doing so. However, the fact that the Duke accepts by nominating another, less wealthy man to participate in his place, it means that the wealthy farmer's son has still not been held accountable for his actions. Therefore, the Duke is not back in control at the top of the power hierarchy. This passage therefore reflects the beginnings of Don Quixote's realisation that "feudalism no longer exists except in a perverted form" (Johnson 1990: 18).

This reversal of the direction of the irony, in comparison to what would traditionally have been perceived in this passage, is key to the progression of the novel as a whole in the way that it forms a fundamental part of Don Quixote's character evolution towards sanity and wisdom by this late stage in the novel. As Marianella has noted, this episode represents "an illustration of the failure of Don Quixote (as a knight-errant) and the theme of literature and life" (1979: 140). In essence, this episode drives home to the reader just how far removed from his contemporary everyday life Don Quixote's chivalric ideals and self-perceived role are, though Don Quixote does not yet know it himself. This stage in the protagonist's transition is further illustrated by the fact that the change in his role, from ironist to victim, makes up almost all of the sole function of irony of events in the third sally.<sup>207</sup> As this steady change continues and Don Quixote moves further away from the role of ironic victim, there has emerged a direct correlation between the reader's decreasing estimations of his antagonists and their increasing regard for Don Quixote's character. Don Quixote is becoming ever less the chivalrous character of literature of old, and more a vulnerable old man for whom the reader feels sorry in the face of the other characters' cruel treatment of him. The more the trickster is tricked, the better Don Quixote appears in

---

<sup>207</sup> The only other example of irony of events is the timing of Sanson Carrasco's early offer to serve Don Quixote as his squire in Sancho's place (Part II, Chapter 7).

comparison.<sup>208</sup> However, in line with Muecke's definition in order to fit the criteria to be classed as irony of events, and not merely the dramatized irony of self-betrayal, the situation must also be "completed by the discomfiture of the victim" (1969: 104-105). It is therefore worth noting that later on in Chapter 45 Tosilos, the farmer's son, does marry Doña Rodríguez' daughter, thanks to Don Quixote's intervention in the situation, much to the Duke's horror.

Although the individuals who serve as vehicles for the execution of Cervantes' irony vary widely as the novel progresses, the actual subject matter which is being exposed and mocked by him remains constant throughout. This is central to successfully steering Don Quixote to a position where the reader views him as sane and noble, because the contrast between the continuity and consistency in the targets of Cervantes' irony, against the transiency of its victims, helps to further accentuate this increasingly high regard for Don Quixote's character. As Allen has noted, while in the first and second sallies the level of irony remains high, by the third it has not only "sharply reduced" but also continues to be "progressively descending" (2008: 188). The driving factor behind this shift is that Don Quixote no longer shows any sign of the confident unawareness of the deceit from before. Another major significance of this episode, in the context of Cervantes' irony, is the fact that it serves as one of the most noticeable examples of the "loss-of-reality effect" (Egginton 2022: 1059) which pervades the second part of the novel and as a result of which, the previously clear boundaries between the real and the fictitious, are now blurred. That Doña Rodríguez has turned to Don Quixote for help in the first place is testament to the extent of this confusion, as Don Quixote is being treated as a fictional character by the Duke's court at the time when she asks him for help with a real-life problem. Previously, at the start of Part I, the reader and other characters and alike were clear and secure in their positions that Don Quixote was mad and everyone else was sane, but they can no longer rely on this surety. If they can no longer trust in the knowledge that he is mad, especially when other characters such as Doña Rodríguez behave in such as gullible and blind way as to suggest that they in fact are, the prospect of Don Quixote actually being sane and lucid by this point towards the end of the story becomes viable.<sup>209</sup>

---

<sup>208</sup> This technique of contrast was also used by Cervantes in the tenth instance of irony analysed, and also follows in the eighteenth.

<sup>209</sup> See Egginton (2002: 1059) for fuller analysis of the importance of viability and what facilitates it.

How the three translations present the Duke as the instigator of this deception and the plea for help which follows, and how successfully they retain his unscrupulous selfishness, is therefore crucial to successfully retaining Cervantes' irony here. Once again, it is Ormsby who does this most effectively and once again Duffield's and Watts' versions are extremely similar to one another.<sup>210</sup> In Duffield's and Watts' translations Doña Rodríguez informs the reader, via Don Quixote, that she has complained to the Duke "many" times, whereas in Ormsby's she has done so "many and many a time". One of the reasons why Ormsby's offers the most effective translation of irony in this case, is because it bears a closer formal likeness to the source text. Although structural similarity to the original does not always equate to a good translation, in fact, it often results in a more unnatural sounding version in the target language;<sup>211</sup> in this instance it is very much relevant. Cervantes could simply have stated that the distressed mother had complained "muchas veces", but instead he intentionally labours the point by extending this to "no una, sino muchas veces". The effect of this on the reader is that it fully demonstrates the extent of her anguish and how helpless she now feels as a result of having had no success with the Duke for so long despite several attempts. By condensing their versions to exclude this repetition, both Duffield and Watts have effectively belittled the full force of the mother's torment. Given that it is the Duke or, more specifically, his selfishly motivated inaction which has caused this torment, by toning this down Duffield's and Watts' translations leave him rendered in a less unfavourable light than Ormsby's in the eyes of the reader. In Ormsby's the reader's contempt for the insensitive and cowardly Duke grows and lays the foundations for the consolidation of this disgust later when Tosilos does eventually marry the woman's daughter. In Duffield's and Watts' versions, the ironic significance of this later announcement is therefore diminished. This negative and cowardly view of the Duke is centrally important to the progression of the novel as a whole, as by this stage in Part II the transformation of Don Quixote's character into a noble and respectable hero is, although by

---

<sup>210</sup> Although it is not known at exactly what stage Duffield and Watts went their separate ways and began working on their own individual versions, the fact that the two are still so similar at this stage strongly suggests that they had not yet parted company.

<sup>211</sup> Duffield's decision to actively steer away from glossing in the first quote analysed successfully renders his translation the most ironic in that instance; in the fifth quote analysed Ormsby intentionally opts for a translation of *cura* sufficiently far from the original as to produce a marked collocation, to emphasise the point that there is no direct translation in English; in the tenth quote analysed, although all three gloss the word *gloria* Ormsby's becomes the version which most successfully translates Cervantes' irony, by choosing to more freely translate the syntax whereas Duffield and Watts stick almost entirely to the original.

no means complete yet, certainly well underway. One of the ways Cervantes achieves this, is by constructing situations in which the Duke and the knight are placed in a position of direct comparison, presenting them to the reader and forcing the reader to evaluate them against one another. In doing so, the more the Duke is viewed negatively in the reader's eyes, the more Don Quixote's character climbs in their estimations, and so in Duffield's and Watts' translations the protagonist's character evolution is not progressed to the same degree as in Ormsby's.

A further illustration of how, in this case, it is justifiable that Ormsby's version is regarded as the best of the nineteenth-century translations is visible in the name given to the Duke's financial misdemeanours, his driving motivation for not intervening to help Doña Rodríguez. Duffield translates "*trampas*" as "fooling", and Watts as "pranks", yet neither of these terms suggest any direct link to gambling or even money in general. The *DRAE* offers a number of definitions, one of which explicitly refers to a debt which has gone unpaid,<sup>212</sup> and this connotation is also present in nineteenth-century dictionaries: Caballero's *Diccionario de la lengua española* includes among its numerous definitions of "trampa", "deuda contraída con engaño" (1865: 860). This monetary element is missing from Duffield's and Watts' and so a reader of their translations without an extensive knowledge of the history of the Spanish language could easily read the above passage fail to pick up on Cervantes irony: to think the Duke had little more at stake than pride or bravado, having played practical jokes for which he has been exonerated thanks to the farmer vouching for him, removes one half of the monetary-moral equation.

If the Duke embodies the hypocritical view of Cervantes' day that money and moral were mutually existent, then by removing money from the picture it obscures the existence of this hypocrisy from most readers. In doing so, Duffield and Watts inhibit the author's original irony. In contrast, by occupying such a rank as Duke and then somehow managing to squander it all away through gambling, only to intentionally turn a blind eye to precisely the kind of situation in which he should have been intervening as the community's leader, in Ormsby's version the undeniably present monetary aspect means the Duke could not prove a more effective illustration of how money does not automatically equal morality. The *Tesoro* definition, which reflects the use of the term "trampas" as it would have been in

---

<sup>212</sup> <http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=trampas>

Cervantes' *day*, highlights the versatility of its meanings in a way which could have been related or completely unrelated to gambling:

El cepo, ô otro género de artificio... Dixole trampa del verbo Francés etromper, que vale engañar, haziendo caer a uno, y trampicar. Se dize de qualquiera engaño que uno haze a otro, ô en cuenta, y ratos, ô en juegos, ô de otra qualquier manera. (1611 II: 193).

This passage is therefore one of many illustrations of just how subtle Cervantes' irony can be, and it is therefore not surprising that the two translators with the least prior background in Cervantes studies, or even Hispanic studies in general, failed to notice it in this case.

18. *“Mira, amigo, que no te hagas pedazos; da lugar que unos azotes aguarden a otros; no quieras apresurarte tanto en la carrera, que en la mitad della te falte el aliento; quiero decir que no te des tan recio que te falte la vida antes de llegar al número deseado.”*

(II, 71: 1026)

Duffield:

“Have a care, my friend, and cut not thyself to pieces; let the stripes stay eachother’s leisure; make not such haste that thou lose thy breath in the midst of the race – I mean lay not on so pitilessly that thou lose thy life before thou reachest the desired number...”

(p 697)

Ormsby:

“Take care, my friend, not to cut thyself to pieces; allow the lashes to wait for one another, and do not be in so great a hurry as to run thyself out of breath midway; I mean, do not lay on so strenuously as to make life fail thee before thou hast reached the desired number...”

(p 336)

Watts:

“Take care, Sancho, that thy dost not lash thyself to pieces; give time for one stroke to await another; thou shouldst not hurry thyself so much in thy career as to fail of breath in the middle of it; do not, I say, lay on so warmly as for thy life to fail thee before reaching the required number...”

(p 372)

This final ironic quote to be analysed in this study is from one of the last chapters of Part II, in which Sancho tricks his master by going into the woods to lash himself, as agreed between the two, for a price. Mid-way through administering the beatings to himself, Sancho changes his mind and instead begins to whip the trees nearby in order to deceive

his master into thinking he has completed his side of the deal as agreed. The main purpose of this irony is to illustrate how Don Quixote's character evolution from madness to sanity is all but complete, paving the way for the forthcoming deathbed scene when his spiritual and ideological journey finally concludes.

A major tool used by Cervantes to evidence the progress of the knight's character evolution here, is the use of religious imagery in relation to other characters who surround him. This first entered the field of observation in the eighth chapter of Part II,<sup>213</sup> and in this later example Sancho's supposed portrayal as a devout and holy man is further tested, albeit this time through his actions rather than his words. The motif of self-flagellation, and the element of martyrdom involved in taking a punishment for someone else's gain, could scarcely construct a more Christ-like image of Don Quixote's squire, and yet this is in fact all a façade. In reality, it is Don Quixote who promotes the struggle against vice through self-purification, doing so vicariously via Sancho in this instance, by ordering him to suffer the beating rather than taking it upon himself. Meanwhile Sancho, who knowingly deceives his master into thinking he has undertaken the painful thrashing and in doing so allows his master to feel such a genuine level of concern for his welfare, as is demonstrated by his words in the above quote, emerges as a dishonest and greedy man who continues to think only of himself. It is as a result of this ironic self-betrayal on Sancho's part, that Don Quixote immediately appears more righteous and honourable in comparison. The significance of this antagonistic tension in their relationship is of major importance in the context of the protagonist's transition to sanity, and Cervantes uses the irony embedded in this situation to convey to the reader that this transition is almost complete but has stalled at the last minute, at a point where it cannot progress to the final stage of completion until something ends the stalemate between the pair's expectations of each other. As Johnson puts it, "the Duke and Duchess have succeeded in polarising Sancho and Don Quixote by making what each of them holds most dear dependant on the other" (1990: 68), and as a result their relationship will be haunted by "the whiplash factor... Sancho ingeniously trying to evade what Don Quixote most wants him to do, provoking crisis after crisis" (ibid).

---

<sup>213</sup> Sancho, when describing his own religious beliefs, states that "cuando otra cosa no tuviese sino el creer, como siempre creo, firme y verdaderamente en Dios y en todo aquello que tiene y cree la Santa Iglesia Católica Romana, y el ser enemigo mortal, como lo soy, de los judíos, debían los historiadores tener misericordia de mí y tratarme bien en los escritos".

To what extent the three nineteenth-century translations retained this contrast and conflict, is therefore extremely important in determining which of the three most effectively translated Cervantes' original. Moreover, a further aspect for prior consideration, is the ongoing debate over whether or not Don Quixote retains at this point any nuances of the ingénue from earlier in the novel. All surface indications seem to point towards this being a rare example at this late stage in Cervantes' novel of the knight still retaining the unwitting naivety of earlier; not only does he fail to see through Sancho's deceit and continue to believe he has carried out the agreed number of thrashes, such is the depth of his belief in his squire that he is also concerned to the point of distress immediately prior to Sancho heading into the woods. However, at this point in the novel when the knight's transition from foolishness to wisdom has progressed so consistently, it defies all reasoning why Cervantes would have undone this only a few chapters from the end of the story. A more likely explanation, therefore, is that Don Quixote is entirely aware of Sancho's trickery but chooses not to reveal this to him. Instead, Cervantes uses his knight as a means of ridiculing Sancho through excessive use of praise, one of the very vices criticised in the first sally of Part I.<sup>214</sup> Moreover, the fact that Don Quixote not only voices his concerned regard for Sancho's welfare during the course of this noble deed not once, but twice, accentuates even further the underlying sarcasm and is one of the few hidden indicators of Cervantes' subtle irony here. On the surface, the knight's words present Sancho to the reader as a selfless, Christ-like lamb to the slaughter, which Allen has also noted is little more than "satiric reduction through hyperbolic praise" (2008: 122). The satire voiced by Don Quixote is not confined merely to Sancho but is also aimed, via him, at the religious institutions and expectations of Cervantes' day. Upon an initial reading of this passage, it is immediately apparent that even the lashes which Sancho does inflict on himself as opposed to the tree are far from vigorous, and it could be strongly argued that this represents Cervantes' disdain for hypocritical outward displays of piety and devotion which are often underpinned by very little substance. Whilst it is true that it is impossible to ever know for certain if this was Cervantes' view when writing this passage, Johnson has also detected the apparent direction of the author's criticism when she notes that, since the Council of Trent (1545-63) "the important thing for Catholic orthodoxy was the work performed, and the reference to the individual's attitude was too close to Protestantism"

---

<sup>214</sup> See Allen (2008: 140-141).

(1990: 15). The fact that two of the three nineteenth-century translations, and the two which have by now evidenced themselves as the most consistently successful translations of Cervantes' irony, have also detected and retained an underlying criticism of the Catholic Church in Spain during Cervantes' time adds further support to my proposed argument. The two adverbs used by Duffield and Ormsby – "pitilessly" and "strenuously", respectively – carry a much greater sense of cruelty and vigour than Watts' use of "warmly", which is more usually associated with embraces, greetings or other instances of affection. This suggests that, once again, Watts' has failed to pick up on the element of religious critique in Cervantes' irony.

This pretended doubt was also present in the sixteenth quote analysed in this study, when reference was made to the suggested possibility of a coexistence of poverty and honour, and as noted it plays a major role in Don Quixote's movement towards sanity. The fact that it is also present here therefore adds yet more weight to the argument that Don Quixote is by now no longer an ingénue. Moreover, as Sancho's attempts at utilising religious imagery for the sake of his own portrayal backfires, rendering him ever more dishonest and self-centred in the eyes of the reader, Don Quixote's presentation cannot fail to benefit from this. Instead of confronting Sancho himself and challenging him over his deceit, Don Quixote's spiritual journey has progressed far enough that he is willing to leave any judgement to God, an idea that the arrogant and overzealous righter of wrongs from Part I could never have entertained. By now, Don Quixote demonstrates his increasingly reflective nature in the way he heeds Sancho's own words from earlier in the third sally, words which Sancho himself obviously does not follow:

Pero encomendémoslo todo a Dios, que Él es el sabidor de las cosas que han de suceder en este valle de lágrimas, en el mal mundo que tenemos, donde apenas se halla cosa que esté sin mezcla de maldad, embuste y bellaquería. (I, 11: 613).

As a result, although there is still an ironic self-betrayal occurring here, instead of being used by Cervantes to evoke a negative portrayal of his protagonist as was previously the case, it is now one which "evokes sympathy and understanding rather than blame or ridicule" (Allen 2008: 171).

Watts' recurrent failure to detect Cervantes' irony is again visible here, through his reference to the "required" number of lashes rather than the "desired" number in the two other nineteenth-century translations. His adjective deviates from the original, which could quite easily have been glossed as the other two translators did. Moreover, given that Watts

had a much lesser command of the Spanish language than Ormsby, it is striking that he should intentionally opt for a bolder move away from the source text than his peer who was much better versed in Spanish. It is therefore a fair assumption that Watts must have had a specific reason for doing so, and yet not only is this not clear but it also destroys the original irony intended. In the first two translations, Sancho is to inflict on himself the number of lashes deemed appropriate by his master alone, without any divine obligation or command from God. This element of needlessness better reflects the selfishness behind Sancho's motives for enduring the beating, as he is essentially doing it through choice purely in order to reap the rewards later. In contrast, in Watts' translation, the number of beatings is mandatory, final and prerequisite and so Sancho is absolved of the responsibility for his own suffering. The more pain and cruelty he suffers in the first two, the more selfish and foolish he becomes; the more he suffers in Watts' version, the more of a Christian-like martyr he seems. The problem here is that Cervantes is, at this late stage in the novel, trying to consolidate Don Quixote's character evolution toward sanity and righteousness, and so if either of the two men should be portrayed as a martyr it should be him not Sancho. As a result, Watts' version impedes the progress of this transition, suggesting he has not fully detected that it is underway.

I have previously touched upon Watts' lesser command of the theory of Spanish language than Ormsby's, and in this case it appears that this is also true in comparison with Duffield. This much is evident through the fact that, on this rare occasion, there are major variations between all three of the translations. The reason why this is significant is that it is not known exactly when Duffield and Watts dissolved their joint venture and began working on their own versions. However, the marked variance between their two versions in this instance strongly indicates that by this stage in the translation process they were no longer working together. Whereas in the first clause of the above example Watts deviated from the original when he should not have, in the second he does the opposite and retains *carrera* when he should not. Had he modified the syntax to enable him to use "career"<sup>215</sup> in the verb form then this would have perfectly portrayed the sense of speed in Don Quixote's warning not to lash himself too quickly or vigorously as to pass out. By retaining it as a noun it makes little sense, as Sancho's career has only ever, to the reader's knowledge, been serving as Don Quixote's squire and before that he was a peasant farmer.

---

<sup>215</sup> "move swiftly and in an uncontrolled way".

(<http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/career?q=career>)

Duffield's alternative use of "race" still sticks closely to the original translation and still retains the imagery of speed almost present in Watts' version. In particular, Duffield does so by creating this instant contrast between Don Quixote's specific word choice and the meaning of his complete sentence – he calls it a race on one hand, but then tells Sancho not to hurry on the other. Duffield's is also more accurately reflective of the element of competition and glory seeking than Watts'. By creating a race Duffield will also then create a winner and a loser, and the winner must always receive a prize. This further flags up to the reader that Sancho had initially refused Don Quixote's request to whip himself for Dulcinea's sake, only to later change his mind and agree once financial remuneration has been offered. As a result in Duffield's version, unlike in Watts', Sancho remains the more selfish and greedy of the two main characters.

Ormsby's is the safest of the translations in this case, having chosen to omit *carrera* from his translation altogether. The result is that it flows much more naturally in the target language from the reader's point of view, and it also enhances and justifies the need for the following clause which reiterates his warning in more detail. Had he provided enough detail the first time, it would have rendered the further explanation unnecessary. This is important, as the rambling and repetitive nature of Don Quixote's warning depicts a man who is genuinely concerned for Sancho's welfare; without this Don Quixote would seem callous and uncaring. But by being so visibly anxious about Sancho's welfare, Don Quixote's transition towards sanity seems even closer to completion, as he is now able to empathise with others in a way he was utterly unable to previously.

## CONCLUSIONS

### 1. The Importance of studying irony in *Don Quixote*

The role of irony in English translations of *Don Quixote* remains a topic which has never before been the focus of any intensive critical attention.<sup>216</sup> This is particularly surprising, given that Cervantes was the first author for several decades, if not centuries, to incorporate this linguistic feature into his to the extent and in the manner that he did (Russell 1969: 314).<sup>217</sup> It is also the versatility of irony which further promotes the importance of studying its presence, because through its different forms irony allows for one of the clearest views of how Cervantes' novel was received by his readers across the centuries. Such varying forms of irony identified by critics include Socratic irony, Romantic irony, irony of events (Allen 2008: 183), stable or unstable, general or specific, comic and limited irony (Allen 2008: 115). In relation to Cervantes' works in particular, different forms include "sustained" (De Bruyn 2009: 38), "grave and serious" (Wilmot 1774: 1; Addison 1712; Ardila 2009: 10, 28), "playful and capricious" (Close 2000: 12), all of which are consistently "subtle" (Close 1978: 248). Each distinct form of irony appealed to different classes or generations of readers in a different way, and each therefore offers an insight into their reception of *Don Quixote* from a slightly different angle. In the context of its reception in the nineteenth century, the study of irony is particularly important as it also sheds further light on whether or not *Don Quixote* should have been read as a Romantic novel.

In fact, it is not until one begins to study irony in Cervantes' novel that the full extent of the importance of doing so becomes clear. The fact that the view of Cervantes' irony over the centuries has changed so much is proof that to fully understand such a complex phenomenon as Cervantes' unique brand far exceeds the possibilities of any one single study. However, once familiar with the basic premise, it becomes clear very early on in *Don Quixote* that it is in fact only by playing at being a fool that the protagonist is able to successfully carry out the author's ironic intention. Don Quixote himself states that "la más discreta figura de la comedia es el bobo" (II: 3, 566), and Shelton conveyed this sentiment

---

<sup>216</sup> See the introductory chapter of this study for further exploration of the few studies which have been carried out on related topics, and the remaining gaps in research.

<sup>217</sup> See pp. 27-29 of this thesis for an examination of this in more detail.

perfectly when he put it in his own words as, “the cunningest part in a play is the Fool’s; because hee must not bee a Fool that would well counterfeit to seem so” (1733: 22). Although most modern critics have tended to take the view that *Don Quixote* was not entirely intended as a comical work, Russell echoes Cervantes’ and Shelton opinion when he notes that in order for irony to be successfully executed there needs to be at least some element of comedy involved. The study of irony is therefore also important because as well as adding to the debate over a Romantic *Don Quixote* it also helps shed some light on this other ongoing critical dispute, over the comic versus the serious view of Cervantes’ novel.

## 2. Irony as an explanation as to why several translations were produced in such quick succession at the end of the nineteenth century

To attempt to say for certain why these three nineteenth-century translations were published so suddenly and so close together would be impossible without relying heavily on speculation. Although Duffield’s and Watt’s acknowledge in their paratexts that they began working on theirs more than a decade prior to the publication dates, the fact that three appeared so quickly after more than a century without any cannot be merely coincidence. In a recent chronology of *Don Quixote* in the English-speaking world Álvarez and Joque cite the novel’s rise to literary stardom during earlier centuries as the cause.<sup>218</sup> They argue that this had created a surge in interest among readers, which was satiated for a while by the existing translations available, but which would ultimately outgrow this and call for several more almost instantaneously. It is difficult to accept this argument as being true, given it is impossible to prove or disprove either way; there is no known surviving documentation to support the assertion that it offered, either from the translators themselves or from critics, publishers or other *Cervantistas* of their day. Given how lengthy and thorough the prefaces and other supplements which accompanied each of the nineteenth-century translations were, if the above theory were true it seems odd then that neither translator thought to put it into words when discussing their motivations for choosing to undertake a translation.

Aside from the reliance on speculation, a further issue with Álvarez and Joque’s theory is that it altogether lacks plausibility. If demand among readers for current and fresh translations of *Don Quixote* were indeed as consistently high as they claim, it seems more

---

<sup>218</sup> <http://www.lib.umich.edu/cervantes/>

conceivable that supplying this demand would also have to be done on a more sustained basis and not in sporadic bursts every hundred years or so.

A third issue is that their theory does not offer any explanation of what determines when the demand for more *Don Quixote* translations will suddenly reappear. Prior to the first of the nineteenth-century translations being published there had been a gap of 117 years, since Wilmot's in 1774. Prior to that there had been a scattering of versions produced around the middle of the century, such as Smollett's and Jervas', which were in turn preceded by Motteux's in 1700 and Phillips' in 1687. The distribution of these publication dates is much more even than Álvarez and Joque's theory would suggest, or even allow for. If their theory were true, there would have been a gradual and sustained spread of publication dates of translations in direct proportion to the novel's increasing pre-eminence in the literary sphere. There must, therefore, have been something more about the latter stages of the nineteenth century than the emergence of the novel which caused the immense delay followed by the impromptu outpouring in the 1880s. Pardo suggests that the answer lies in the fact that the 1880s saw the beginning of the run up to the tercentenary celebrations of the publication date of the first part of *Don Quixote*, and there began to emerge a renaissance of Cervantine study and critical interest. The situation in England strongly supports this theory, as the presence of this literary resurgence is undeniable towards the end of the nineteenth century. Although there were no new translations of *Don Quixote* produced prior to the 1880s, there were numerous reproductions of earlier versions including those by Smollett, Jervas and Moteux (Calvert 1905: 129-33). This trend in translations was also paralleled by biographies of Cervantes: the first known biography was published in 1676 in Rome, followed by the handful published during the eighteenth century as already discussed, but by the second half of nineteenth century there was a new one emerging almost every five years.<sup>219</sup> In the specific context of the translations produced by Duffield, Ormsby and Watts, only the publishing house that produced Watts' version remains extant today and has not been able to provide

---

<sup>219</sup> Calvert (1905: 135-138) outlines these, and although his book includes a full list of all known previous translations as well as a synopsis of previous editions and versions of *Don Quixote*, he offers very little critical analysis of the instances of irony he identifies.

any further insight into the critical climate at the time, subsequent publication figures, or additional biographical information to help plug the existing gap.<sup>220</sup>

The 1890s saw the publication of new critical works by major nineteenth-century influences on literary thinking and reception in English, such as Hallam, Hazlitt and Coleridge. The same decade also saw the production of Morrison's theatrical adaptation (1895), and Buchan's novel *Sir Quixote of the Moors* (1895). Cervantine interest remained high throughout the decade and, after having published a biography of Cervantes in 1892, Fitzmaurice-Kelly also produced *A History of Spanish Literature* (1898). There was a further biography of Cervantes' life produced by Calvert (1905), as well as two additional works by Fitzmaurice Kelly (1905; 1907).<sup>221</sup> That there was sufficient demand for the publication of these works indicates that the increased interest in the man behind the novel, who had first appeared almost a century previously, very much remained as the nineteenth century drew to a close.

The second half of that century was undeniably a hotbed of critical reception and interpretation for both Cervantes and *Don Quixote*, and as one of the "narrative designs which draw the complicit reader into an elaborate game of interpretation" (Sham 2009: 242), the abundance of irony in Cervantes' novel was one of the reasons for this. The new works being produced were also accompanied by a number of notable reproductions, and as well as those listed above Ormsby's was reproduced in 1907, having already been reprinted in New York in 1906 by the Thomas Cromwell Company. This is particularly telling, as it not only indicates just how widely spread the newfound re-interest among English-speaking readers was in Cervantes and his works around the end of the nineteenth century, but also how central Ormsby's translation was to this. Watts' translation was also reprinted in 1895, and Lockhart's revision of Motteux's translation had recently been published in 1880 to include a biography of Motteux by Van Laun. The significance of these publications during the years leading up to the tercentenary of *Don Quixote*, is that it provides a more empirically substantive support of Pardo's argument than can be found for that of Álvarez and Joque. Other critics also share this view, having noted that Cervantes'

---

<sup>220</sup> Watts' was published by Quaritch, Duffield's by C. Kegan Paul & Co. and Ormsby's by Smith, Elder & Co, who were a major nineteenth century publisher responsible for works by the likes of Bronte, Browning, Gaskell, Hardy, Ruskin and Tennyson.

<sup>221</sup> Other examples include Díaz de Benjumea (1878), although admittedly this would only have been accessible to critics familiar with the Spanish language, and Duffield's (1881) own critical commentary which was published separately from his translation.

critical renaissance coincided with the predominance of Dickens, and the two are said to have shared a “maravillosa eficacia intelectual y humorístico-sentimental” (Pérez de Ayala 1958: 68). The underlying reason for the renaissance of Cervantine interest is therefore simply a reflection of wider nineteenth-century conditions, and the way these fostered an atmosphere of nostalgia among readers and critics.

During the last decades of the century, the role of literature was becoming increasingly sympathetic to the wider social and political environment (Pardo 2011: 376), and in particular this was a reaction to the widespread Industrial Revolution that was in full swing during the last decades of the nineteenth century.<sup>222</sup> This again links back to the discussion of the Pre-Raphaelite movement, as tastes in art were mirrored in literature and readers looked to turn away from the modern to the medieval past in order to escape the dirt, noise and mechanisation of industrialisation. Whilst a Pre-Raphaelite movement would not dovetail entirely, the nostalgic act of looking to the past for comfort and solace does establish a firm if partial overlap. Nostalgia may also be considered Romantic because it urges the reader to put the most rose-tinted view on the past, irrespective of whether or not it was the case, exactly as many advocates of the Romantic approach to *Don Quixote* have been criticised for. Hutcheon has highlighted the “very real and very uneasy tension” between irony and nostalgia (1998),<sup>223</sup> and argues that the act of nostalgia by definition implies an inaccurate recollection of the past. She suggests that “it is the very pastness of the past, its inaccessibility, which likely accounts for a large part of nostalgia's power... This is rarely the past as actually experienced... it is the past as imagined, as idealized through memory and desire” (ibid). As a result, if nineteenth-century critics and readers of *Don Quixote* had not exercised some degree of nostalgic licence, their reception of both the story and its protagonist would have varied very little from the reception in the early seventeenth century.<sup>224</sup> The reference to idealisation marks the clear link between this nostalgia and a Romantic reception of the story, its protagonist and also the man behind it, which was very much still alive in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. This was facilitated so smoothly by two factors; firstly, by Cervantes’ success as an author and that as

---

<sup>222</sup> See Feinstein (1998) and Lindert & Williamson (1983) for an in-depth exploration of the ongoing debate over the impact of the Industrial Revolution on nineteenth-century British society.

<sup>223</sup> <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/utel/criticism/hutchinp.html>

<sup>224</sup> For an overview of Hutcheon’s view of irony, which rejects the traditional view of irony as antiphrasis in favour of in fact being an oscillation between two mutually co-existent meanings, see Hutcheon (1994).

a result of this there was such a strong legacy to look back to. Secondly, his time spent as a soldier straightaway offers a ready-made apparatus on which Romantic thinkers could sow and germinate their interpretation. As Calvert has noted of Cervantes, “as soldier and author he has a double claim upon the admiration and regard of posterity” (1905: 2), and these two factors combined help to bridge the themes of nostalgia and Romanticism in the critical reception of *Don Quixote*. Insofar as any such comment on the reason why so many translations emerged so close together is possible, the parameters of this study automatically limit any explanation I can offer to that which can be deduced from looking at irony only. This is also true in relation to seeking to answer one of the predominant assumptions around the three nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote* – that is, that Ormsby’s deserves its status as the most highly regarded and successful, at least of the nineteenth-century versions, if not of all translations ever produced. Restricted though this scope may be, the evidence that my research offers in favour of these existing critical assumptions is overwhelming.

This preference for nostalgia gathered even more momentum when considered in the context of the fact that, by the second half of the nineteenth century, levels of literacy were higher than ever before and new practices in publishing and literary circulation were emerging (Brantlinger 1998: 2). These meant that reading material was ever more accessible to the ever-expanding reading public. Of the abundance of reading material at their disposal, readers in England in the nineteenth century looked to previous genres and styles for diversion. This not only explains why translators responded to this trend by supplying the reading public with new versions of his masterpiece, but also with a biographical insight into the author himself, so that they could immerse themselves in the culture surrounding the source text as well.

### 3. Are existing critical assumptions regarding the success of nineteenth-century translators’ versions justified?

Critics are very rarely specific about what they actually refer to about Ormsby’s translation when they describe it as the most successful, just as the comparative lack of critical commentary on Duffield’s and Watts’ versions sheds almost no light on the reasons why these are viewed as inferior to his. However, the evidence I have gathered during the course of my own study of irony in *Don Quixote* strongly supports these popular

assumptions, and also offers some indications as to the reasons for this. The most straightforward of these explanations is that, of the representative sample of eighteen instances of irony I have analysed, it was Ormsby who most successfully detected and retained Cervantes' original irony. Out of the sample, Ormsby recognised and retained the original irony on ten occasions; on six of these occasions Duffield and Watts failed to do so, on three both Duffield and Ormsby both produced successful translations of the irony, and on three occasions Watts copied Ormsby's translation strategy (in the seventh and fifteenth instances of irony all three translations successfully retained Cervantes' original irony). Although it may seem simplistic to reduce the analysis of such a complex subject to quantifiable numbers, the reality is that if a translator does not pick up on the irony in the first place then anything they do to it during that translation process can only ever be accidental at best. This view is supported by other critics, who have pointed that "interpreting an ironic message is nothing more than deciphering correctly those messages intended ironically" (De Wilde 2010: 27). Without identifying them, they cannot be deciphered, and this view is shared among other critics in addition to De Wilde. Coromines i Calders, for example, agrees that "the narrator leads the reader into a tricky triangle of semantic possibilities and unexpected connotations. When (if) the reader grasps the irony, s/he has the feeling that the narrator has deliberately sent him/her round in circles instead of guiding him/her on a straight line. But the reader obtains some compensation: s/he not only decodes the core information but receives an extra added value of surprise, unexpectedness, and even suspense" (2010: 63). Therefore, in the case of translations as opposed to texts which remain in their source language, there is even more at stake. If the translator (as the original "reader") has not grasped the irony in the source text then their subsequent reader will, in turn, be presented with an already distorted misrepresentation of the original author's intended irony.

There are two explanations for Ormsby's greater success that seem most plausible, the first being the fact that he benefitted from the very recent publication of Duffield's version only four years earlier. Ormsby was therefore able to use this as a starting point, gauging from the responses of readers and critics what had been liked and disliked about that version, and bear this in mind when producing his own. Whilst Ormsby certainly alludes to the fact in the Introduction to his translation that he has not read Duffield's version, he does concede that he is not only aware of it but has also has opinions about it. That much is indicated by him going out of his way to state that it would be impertinent of

him to voice these (1885: 3-7). Despite his insistence to the contrary, by having critical opinions on Duffield's translation it is obvious that he was in fact familiar with it.

Ormsby himself also offers further evidence to explain the success of his translation in the introductory chapters that accompany it. The first factor to make itself unmistakably clear is that he wrote with commercial success in mind and was driven by the goal of critical acclaim, rather than it being purely a labour of love. As the one of the three translators to have followed a more literary and academic career, this seems a surprising assertion, but he is quite open about the fact in his paratexts: he explains that he first set out to reproduce Shelton's "racy old version, with all its defects, has a charm that no modern translation, however skilful or correct, could possess."<sup>225</sup> In contrast, when referring to Cervantes' style in *Don Quixote* specifically, he states that "never was great work so neglected by its author. That it was written carelessly, hastily, and by fits and starts, was not always his fault, but it seems clear he never read what he sent to the press."<sup>226</sup> He also admits that it was with "considerable reluctance" that he abandoned this initial project, but gives the following explanation:

*But it was soon made plain to me that to hope for even a moderate popularity for Shelton was vain. His fine old crusted English would, no doubt, be relished by a minority, but it would be only by a minority. His warmest admirers must admit that he is not a satisfactory representative of Cervantes. His translation of the First Part was very hastily made and was never revised by him. It has all the freshness and vigour, but also a full measure of the faults, of a hasty production. It is often very literal—barbarously literal frequently—but just as often very loose. He had evidently a good colloquial knowledge of Spanish, but apparently not much more. It never seems to occur to him that the same translation of a word will not suit in every case.*<sup>227</sup>

The above passage not only proves that he had his end-goal of critical and commercial success in mind at all times when making his translation decisions, it only highlights the previously discussed issue of fidelity and the potential risks or benefits associated with this. Finally, on a related note, this quote illustrates the advantage that Ormsby's academic background afforded him in successfully executing his translation, in a

---

<sup>225</sup> <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/996/pg996.html> (accessed 7th May 2016)

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*

way that was not available to Duffield or Watts. I would argue that it was an interlinked combination of these three factors that resulted in Ormsby's translation emerging as the stronger of the three: by knowing who his version was aimed at and what they as readers would demand from it, he was able to call on the skills he had acquired during the course of his literary career in order to make effective decisions around when to stick closely to the source text, versus when to deviate in order to make the target text more palatable for his target readers. The factors which defined what was more palatable were presented to Ormsby in the fallout of the critical reception of Duffield's version. As his introduction implies, had he not been so driven by commercial success then there is every chance that Ormsby would have stuck to his original aim of reproducing Shelton's version. One could argue that, by the same token as Ormsby gained from observing how Duffield's was received, Watts also benefitted from having Ormsby as his predecessor and should therefore have reaped the same benefits.

Ormsby was not only "extremely well-read in eighteenth-century literature" (Seccombe 1901: 235), he was also especially familiar with that produced by "Defoe, Fielding and Boswell" (ibid), all of which were works heavily influenced by and stylistically indebted to *Don Quixote*. Ormsby was therefore familiar with the English reception of Cervantes' novel over the course of the eighteenth century. During the last three decades of Ormsby's life and career he specialised in the study and translation of great Spanish literary classics. These studies coincided with extended periods of travel all over Spain, and so Ormsby's success in his versions of the Spanish classics was also aided by his "acquaintance with Spain, with its political and literary history, was both deep and wide" (ibid). Seccombe's argument is further supported by more recent critics, who have concurred that translators "interpret texts according to previous readings, the target reader's horizon of expectations, their own ideological constructs and their own explicit and/or implicit views on translation" (De Wilde 2010: 29). Compared to the other two translators, Ormsby's literary academic background gave him the edge on each of the four points. Furthermore, there is some suggestion that Ormsby may have had first-hand knowledge of the La Mancha region, though not enough to support a definite conclusion: Seccombe advised that Ormsby had "thoroughly explored the whole country" (ibid), and goes on to say that it was during an extended trip to an unnamed "mountainous region" that he suffered an illness which resulted in the loss of the majority of his hearing. Given that La Mancha is described as an "elevated plateau... formed over limestone and

surrounded by various mountain ranges” in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*,<sup>228</sup> this may well have been where Ormsby was when he became ill. Irrespective of whether or not this can ever be proven, what can be more reliably inferred from the biographies available is that Ormsby had visited all parts of Spain and is therefore very likely to have seen La Mancha at some point, particularly since he devotes one of the earliest pages in his introductory paratext to a detailed map of the region (1885: ii). There is no evidence to suggest that Watts had been there, and Duffield’s account of it is one of several examples of when he failed to recognise Cervantes’ irony later on during his translation. Duffield spent several weeks travelling round Spain, particularly Castilla, as part of his research for finishing off his translation.<sup>229</sup> Unlike the highly negative descriptions of the region noted earlier in this thesis, however, he describes it in his travel journal as “a region in which it is possible to catch glimpses of the power and glory of Spain, when Spain was at the height of her glory, and to realise what a wonderful country it must have been.” (1889: 231)

Ormsby’s success in translating *Don Quixote* was by no means a chance occurrence, and his translation of *El Cid* (1879) had also enjoyed an extremely positive critical reception less than a decade earlier. This was for two reasons; firstly, its fidelity to the “spirit and grace” (Seccombe 1901: 235) of the Spanish culture and heritage which formed such a fundamental part of the epic poem’s identity. Secondly, due to his extensive understanding of the issues and themes that motivated the original source text author, despite remaining anonymous to this day, to produce the poem in the way they did. As one critic put it, “the text is preceded by a lengthy and well-informed introduction based on wide scholarly reading and offering an alert examination of the issues that have continued to preoccupy Cidian scholars”.<sup>230</sup> By understanding what shaped the identity of the original, Ormsby was able to retain these salient features in his translation and it is the combination of this fidelity with such a level of wider critical awareness that also ensured the success of his translation of *Don Quixote*. Martínez Mata has previously stated, in hypothetical terms rather than with reference to any translator in particular, that the best translations are the ones in which the characters and their conduct “must be seen in the context of their circumstances” (2008: 100) and this applies perfectly to Ormsby. His translation most

---

<sup>228</sup> <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/326391/La-Mancha> , accessed 29<sup>th</sup> April 2014.

<sup>229</sup> This sheds some further light on the question of when it was that Duffield and Watts severed their joint partnership and began working on their own translations, as there is no mention in Duffield’s writings that Watts was with him during this time in Spain.

<sup>230</sup> Truman, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20842> , accessed 9<sup>th</sup> April 2014].

successfully translates the irony manifested in the behaviour of other characters because he understood it better than Duffield or Watts, which is in turn linked to the fact that he had a greater background and grounding in the study of Cervantes' life and works. Fidelity in Ormsby's translation of *Don Quixote* extends beyond the broader, cultural components of the text's wider identity, and he also retained a higher degree of fidelity to the grammatical and linguistic aspects of the text than Duffield's (Pardo 2011: 382). It is noticeable that the same critic does not make any comment on fidelity in Watt's translation whatsoever.

As well as supporting the main line of the little critical consensus there is around the nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote*, my analysis also strongly supports the parallel assumption that it is Watts' which manages this with least success. In comparison to the other two nineteenth-century translators there is a marked lack of biographical information available on Watts, and this makes it more difficult to explore the potential relationship between his own life and the works he produced. As a result, my conclusions in relation to Watts and his translation are formed solely on the outcomes of my analysis conducted in this study. The most significant reason why Watts' translation fails to recognise and retain Cervantes' original irony as capably as Duffield or Ormsby is his use of footnotes, which is both excessive and counter-productive simultaneously. Watts' translation is supplemented with a footnote on five occasions in my sample, and on the majority of these he was the only one of the translators to do so. The fact that his fellow nineteenth-century translators did not use a footnote shows that they did not feel the inclusion of one was necessary on these occasions. The first passage analysed appears at the start of the Prologue to the first part of *Don Quixote*, and so the reader at this stage is only just beginning to get to know the novel. Therefore, by bombarding the reader with references to the second part – the ongoing acrimony between Avellaneda and Cervantes and the one of the most complex aspects of the novel, the presence of multiple narrators – Watts succeeds only in confusing his reader before they have even begun. Admittedly, Duffield does not use footnotes on any of the eighteen occasions, and so the fact that he did not include one in this instance does not offer much scope for discussion. Ormsby, on the other hand, has used footnotes on three occasions and thus did recognise a need for them where appropriate, and yet he did not include one at this early stage.

Watts' overloading of his reader continues in the fourth passage analysed, and at 193 words the footnote here serves as a perfect example of how his verbosity undermines

any ironic message subtly entwined within the text because the reader is so distracted with trying to take in all the extra information. What makes this even more frustrating is the fact that the majority of the information contained in the footnote is not even relevant, and is therefore a waste of the reader's time. The exact name of Cervantes' protagonist is not important, as he is intended to be different things to different readers. By forcing this additional information upon his reader, Watts' prevents them from germinating an image of the knight in their minds, in a way that Duffield's or Ormsby's readers would by now have begun to do. There is one critic who has spoken out in support of Watts' translation over the other two, though this amounts to only three paragraphs in a chapter in a critical anthology (McGrath 2009: 77-78). Overlooking the lack of depth of McGrath's evaluation of the three nineteenth-century translations, his argument also contains a fundamental flaw: he argues that the main reason why it should be Watts' version considered the runner-up to Ormsby's (2009: 77) is because of what he describes as the "many insightful footnotes" Watts includes, which supposedly "provide the reader with the necessary information to appreciate the literary, cultural and historical elements of the novel" (2009: 78). As I have highlighted throughout this thesis, Watts' footnotes are anything but "insightful", and are in fact an unhelpful hindrance. When arguing in favour of Watts' use of footnotes McGrath was able to find only one example, the footnote which accompanied the description of Don Quixote's diet (II, 32) which, incidentally, is over twice the length of his longest footnote among all the instances of irony analysed in this study.

The only notable outcome of reading Watts' long footnote is his apparent need to convince the reader that he is well-informed in the study of Spain's history and literature, and this is again the case in the fifth passage analysed. Although Ormsby also includes a footnote here, with the same purpose of explaining the significance of Sigüenza, there are two key differences between the two versions: Ormsby's footnote is not only much shorter, but the information it contains is also relevant. Whilst it is true that Watts explains where Sigüenza is, and also makes some attempt at distinguishing between the titles of graduate and licentiate, his explanation makes no positive contribution to aiding the reader's understanding of Cervantes' irony. As Colebrooke has noted, irony in its purest Quintilian form of meaning something other than that which is said, can only be detected if the receiver recognises that there is a contrast in the first place:

A word does not have a meaning independent of its social exchange. We know a word is being used ironically when it seems out of place or unconventional. Recognising irony,

therefore, foregrounds the social, conventional and political aspects of language: that language is not just a logical system but relies on assumed norms and values. (2004: 15)

If Watts failed to recognise the irony, this explains why he was therefore unable to actively retain it in his translation. Ormsby, on the other hand, recognises that out of all the uses of irony by the source text author this is one of the best-hidden, and would evade detection even from those target-language readers who did have an academic background in the study of Spanish literature. Ormsby explains to his readers in one concise line where this irony lies, though he only places it in front of the reader and does not feel the need to forcefully spell it out to them. Not for the first time, Watts' apparent insecurities around his lack of academic background in the study of Spain and its literature in comparison to Ormsby show through. He displays the need to let the reader know that he has personally visited La Mancha, offering a comparison of his tour guide to the priest in Cervantes' novel that is entirely irrelevant to his readers' understanding of Cervantes' irony. These trends continue in the case of the thirteenth passage analysed. As usual, Duffield offers no footnote, Ormsby offers one where necessary and keeps his concise, and Watts includes not one but two. The first of these, in which he states very matter-of-factly that "there is something very comical in Cervantes' disclaimer" (1888, VI: 7), is once more an indication of how little Watts has truly understood the nature of the irony intended by Cervantes in *Don Quixote*, even by this stage at the start of Part II. As has been noted on several occasions, Cervantes' novel and protagonist were interpreted in different ways by different readers (De Bruyn 2009: 50; Ardila 2009a: 23; Staves 1972: 194; Pardo 368), and their ability to bend to different readers' expectations is one of the main reasons *Don Quixote* has remained one of the most successful novels of all time. Watts does not appear to recognise this variable and idiosyncratic capability, and tries to instruct the reader exactly how they should interpret what Cervantes is saying.

The second reason for Watts' lack of success in translating irony in *Don Quixote*, his lack of critical background in the study of Spain's history and Cervantes' works, is connected to his overuse of footnotes. What becomes clear throughout the course of reading Watts' translation, is that he seems to lack a clear picture of his target readership. By announcing early on in the prefatory volume to his translation that his is aimed at "those not absolutely ignorant of Spanish", and going on to further state that he will therefore refrain from supplying his reader with overt instructions on how they should interpret the humour (1888, I: vii), Watts straightaway alienates the more general, everyday readers who have

not previously studied Cervantes or Spanish literature. They may instead be more likely to seek out a version which does offer them the additional guidance that may be needed at times, in order to fully understand and appreciate one of the most complex and sophisticated novels ever written. Moreover, the more general reader who simply wishes to read *Don Quixote* for pleasure may well have been put off by having to wade through Watts' entire volume dedicated to critical paratexts before even reaching the start of Part I. The result is that, before his translation has even begun, Watts finds himself left only with the more scholarly of readers. Clearly this factor on its own should not explain why his version did not enjoy as much critical success as Duffield's or Ormsby's, but Watts completely contradicts himself and goes on to alienate the more scholarly readers too. Not only is this achieved through his needless misuse of footnotes, but also his own lack of understanding of Cervantes' irony. This is shown in the fact that of the three nineteenth-century translators it is Watts who never once produces the most successful translation of irony on his own. On two occasions he does so by copying Ormsby's strategy, once he favours Duffield's over Ormsby's, and on two occasions all three translators opted for the same choice. Conversely, Watts is the clear leader in terms of which of the three independently produced the least successful translations of irony. Much like before, he shared this position with Duffield on two occasions, Ormsby on one and both of them on another. However, what is particularly telling is the fact that on the few occasions when Watts did branch out and attempt to offer his own version, his solo translation strategy was the least successful. The fact that this was the case in almost one third of the passages analysed in this study strongly suggests that it is a consistent portrayal of Watts' level of skill and accuracy in translating Cervantes' irony. Unlike Watts, the more scholarly readers with whom he was left after alienating his more general readers are likely to have had some understanding of Cervantes' literary style. The likelihood that they picked up on Watts' failure is evidenced by the fact that his version was so poorly received that it has been almost forgotten in critical circles entirely. Moreover, Watts seems to have been aware of the fact that he had lost these more scholarly readers to Ormsby, as in the 1895 reprint of his translation he includes an even longer biography of Cervantes than previously. This strongly suggests that he was trying to appeal to those who were not familiar with the source text author, thus having done a full U-turn in his target readership.

Duffield's translation has therefore tended to fall into the vacant remaining place in critical thinking, as the nineteenth-century translation which offers the second-most

successful translation of Cervantes' irony, and the conclusions of my study appear to support and reinforce this assumption. As discussed, Duffield detected and retained Cervantes' irony more frequently and consistently than Watts but less so than Ormsby. The most likely reason for this is that he had a greater knowledge and background study of the Spanish language and works of literature produced in Spanish than Watts. However, Duffield acquired this knowledge of Spanish during his time working as a mining engineer in Latin America, specifically in Peru and Bolivia, which would therefore have had two notable consequences. Firstly, the diversity between the different forms of Spanish spoken in the numerous Spanish-speaking countries across the world means that he would not have been that familiar with the Iberian Spanish that formed Cervantes' native tongue, and which Ormsby had studied in detail for decades. This is only problematic when considered in the context of the subtlety of Cervantes' irony, and how well it was often hidden within linguistic aspects of his narratives. There are therefore likely to have been instances where Duffield's lack of knowledge of mainland Spanish prevented him from seeing the intended irony, and a plausible potential example of this is the Sigüenza reference. Secondly, Duffield's lack of a footnote to explain the author's intended criticism of academic snobbery may alternatively have been the result of Duffield's lack of formal grounding in the study of Spanish literature. Although a biography of him written shortly after his death describes Duffield as a Spanish scholar (Hume 1901: 161), there is no further detail provided and certainly no evidence to suggest he had anywhere near the same breadth or depth of Cervantine background as Ormsby. Duffield is not alone in this situation, and Stavans sums up the issue perfectly when he states that:

What a gang of divergent souls Cervantes' translators are: postmen, surgeons, linguists, painters, playwrights, poets, journalists, teachers, scholars, editors, collectors, naughty craftsman and downright plagiarists. (2008: 24)

In fact, what information there is contained in that biography seems to suggest that Duffield's study of Spanish literature was more of a pastime than a profession, stating that he was primarily a "mining engineer... after some study with a view to the clerical profession, he married and emigrated to South America." (ibid) In addition to spending time in Spanish-speaking countries he also spent many years in New Zealand and Australia, which suggests that he was interested in the exploration and study of other cultures in general, not just Spanish or Latin American. Although Duffield states in his Translator's Note that he first read *Don Quixote* in Spanish, only reading it in English immediately prior to

starting work on his translation, the fact that it was Lockhart who carried out the rendering of the sections written in verse in Duffield's translation gives a further indication that he was not confident in the finer grammatical or syntactical elements of the Spanish language. This suggestion is further supported by the description of Duffield's other publication in 1881, entitled *Don Quixote: his Critics and Commentators. A Handy Book for General Readers*, which was considered "a treatise more remarkable for enthusiasm than for sound critical judgement" (ibid).

Notwithstanding these factors which impeded the success of Duffield's translation of irony, there were also a number of elements of his translation which ensured it was better received by critics and readers than Watts'. As previously discussed, the nineteenth-century translations were pioneering in that they offered readers the beneficial support of paratexts alongside their translations, and as the first of the three nineteenth-century versions published this innovative element is especially true of Duffield's. Thanks to his translation readers were able to get to know the source text author, as well as gaining an understanding into why Duffield had opted for a lot of the translation strategies he had. In other words, unlike translators before him Duffield brought a more scholarly reception of *Don Quixote* to a more general and everyday reader. Duffield's readers were already familiar with his use of supporting paratexts as a result of his *Critics and Commentators* published before his translation earlier in the year. In that book he explained that his focus was more on bringing the story of *Don Quixote* to the readers rather than the style in which it was told. This highlights two key differences between Duffield's and Watts' translations: firstly, it shows that Duffield's target readership was clear to him, and his driving motivation appears to have been to make Cervantes' masterpiece accessible and appealing to the "general" masses. Secondly, as well as being clearly defined his target readership was also vast, and by successfully attracting so many readers it explains why his translation enjoyed the comparative level of success in its critical reception that it has.

Although Duffield's translation undeniably received, and continues to receive, a more positive reception than Watts', the fact that they worked together in producing a joint translation at first undoubtedly played a part in ensuring the limits of Duffield's success. Not much is known about their collaboration, and it is not known when they separated. Among the little that has been documented on the subject, it has simply been stated that the pair began working together in the early 1860s, until "differences arose, with the result that the translators finished their labours independently" (Hume 1901: 161).

It is also known that Watts had even less of a formal background in the study of Spain's literature and history, or of Cervantes' other works, than Duffield and yet by working together they both influenced each other's translation style. On the basis of my analysis of the eighteen instances of irony it seems clear that the pair did not separate until very late on in their translation: Watts imitated Duffield's style on 10 occasions, and this lasts until the penultimate passage analysed. Admittedly, Watts also copied Ormsby's translation strategies on some occasions, although this only occurred on three out of these ten occasions. Given the lateness of the likely point of departure between their joint translation efforts, there is very little scope for exploring the key differences in their translation style after they had separated, such as which of the two was more adept at picking up on Cervantes' irony independently of the other besides what has already been discussed.

The most likely source of answers to the key questions surrounding Duffield and Watts' collaboration, such as when it was they parted, the reasons why they parted and what impact this had on their approach to translating *Don Quixote*, can be found in the accompanying paratexts. In fact, a comparative reading of all three shows that there seems to have been acrimony between Watts and both of his peers. Whereas both Duffield and Ormsby offer a critical summary of all of the translations from the centuries preceding theirs, in which they offer both positive and negative comments, Watts focuses only on the nineteenth-century translations. He barely disguises his barbed comments in relation to Duffield's or Ormsby's, referring to his own as a "new and original" translation of *Don Quixote*, accompanied by a biography that purportedly contains new information never before made available to English readers (1888, I: v). The insinuation of both of these remarks is that Duffield's and Ormsby's translations lack originality and that their paratexts make no innovative contribution to the existing knowledge gap around the source text author. In contrast, both of Watts' nineteenth-century predecessors exercise a notably greater degree of decorum in their own critical offerings: Duffield benefits from not finding himself in a position where he has any immediate predecessors to comment on, though he is highly critical of Phillips' version and also comments on Smollett's and Jarvis'. Nevertheless, he makes a point of offering concrete examples to support each of the criticisms he levels.<sup>231</sup> Ormsby, likewise, provides a critical overview of the earlier English

---

<sup>231</sup> Cf. Duffield (1881, I: xlii-lx).

translations (1885, I: iii-vii). However, he goes out of his way to say that it would be “impertinent” of him to comment on Duffield’s (1885, I: vii).

It is also evident throughout the paratexts that Watts harbours a strong personal and emotional attachment to his translation, and he is fiercely defensive of it. At one point he acknowledges his ample use of footnotes, but he makes no apology for this and instead justifies them on account of the degree of labour which went into them (1888, I: vi). He goes on to remark upon the sadness he feels once his translation is complete, as now the “labour can delight no more” (1888, I: xii). As previously noted, he also describes translation as a “harassing and jealous profession” (1888, I: xi), and all of these features combine to create a picture of an individual who does not respond well to criticism, and who lets his emotional involvement in his work take precedence over the quality of work he produces.

In regards to Duffield’s translation, his motivations behind it and the factors that influenced this process, it is his own primary sources that offer the most visibility. In his autobiographical travel book published nearly a decade after his translation, he charts his travels around the world and provides detailed accounts of the places and cultures he experienced. The map attached to the inside front cover has his routes marked on it, illustrating the full extent of his travels: destinations included Bogotá, Baranquilla, Lima, Guayaquil and Potosí as well as North America, Africa, Australasia, Europe, the Middle East and South East Asia. On one hand this proves that Duffield benefitted from a great deal of exposure to the Spanish language, which further supports the assumption that his translation was not the worst of the three. On the other, it simultaneously highlights that his command of the language was not the same mainland Iberian Spanish spoken by Cervantes. Furthermore, the breadth of destinations shows that Duffield was not specifically interested in Hispanic culture and literature over any others, just that he had a passion for experiencing the exotic and the foreign. Unlike Ormsby, whose professional and academic focus for the middle and latter stages of his career was dedicated almost exclusively to Spain. As more of a generalist than a specialist, it explains why Duffield successfully deciphered Cervantes’ irony on some occasions, where Watts often did not, but failed to do so on others, where Ormsby did.

In addition to the broad range of destinations included in Duffield’s travel memoirs, the content of the entries themselves also adds further perspective on the stance from which Duffield approached his translations. As might have been anticipated given his professional background of a mining engineer, he focuses in surprising detail on the

physical geographical aspects of his surroundings over any others. Examples include the chapter detailing his time in Ecuador, when he is enlisted to advise a group of would-be political anarchists on the possible routes from Quito down to Guayaquil (1889: 28-32), and also of the layout of the port there that they intend to try and blockade. In the following chapter he offers a similarly detailed description of the route to Bogotá from the sea (37-38) and a similarly thorough one of the Peruvian coast later (70); he spends an entire page describing the buildings in Lima on Good Friday (51). Throughout the book, there is a very evident desire on his part to understand the physical surroundings in which he finds himself.

There is also a clearly visible personal struggle which Duffield undertakes throughout his travels, which is confronted more openly as the book progresses and which may explain his constant need to analyse all that which is tangible and quantifiable. Duffield appears to be wrestling with the events of the preceding centuries in Latin America, and the role played by nations including Spain and England in those, in a search for answers to the major moral and philosophical questions that accompany him on his travels. The main themes which shape these questions are slavery in during the colonial era, exploitation of gold and silver resources and religion. The first indication of his when he asks himself “is the present condition of Spain in no manner connected with the way she governs her colonies?” (49), in response to his unhappiness at what he perceives to be a lack of religious practice in Latin America. He later switches sides and admits that “nor can I refrain my eyes from looking at home and asking myself to explain to myself the gross ignorance of my own countrymen, to say nothing of their idleness and general sinfulness, their cruelties and the brutish lives which some of them lead” (54). These fluctuations in his stance continue throughout his journal, depicting a man who is struggling to make sense of the world around him.<sup>232</sup>

The most significant insight in Duffield and his translation offered by his *Recollections of Travels Abroad* is the final chapter. In details the time he spent staying with a friend, Don Fernando, during the trip he took to Castilla as preparation for writing his translation. During the dialogue Duffield boasts about his command of the Spanish

---

<sup>232</sup> Further examples include the remorse Duffield expresses at the British colonial presence in Peru (1889: 55); his reference to Spain “pitiful” colonial history (110) and then the way he then switches back to a pro-colonial stance in defence of the Spain’s role in Latin America in his opening passage of Chapter IX (117). Of particular note are his criticisms of the “painfully hideous” mining industry in which he himself worked (141).

language (1889:232), and that he had been given a 1605 first edition of *Don Quixote* as a gift (233). The subsequent chapter reveals that Duffield's own view of his translation was extremely high, as he tells his host one morning over breakfast: "I was with Cervantes in his own beloved Spain, beneath his own sky, hearing him talk, seeing him smile, and asking him questions which were answered in a most sweet voice" (234). Given the lack of critical acclaim that Duffield's translation received in England, as well as the specific examples noted in this thesis of instances where Duffield's "questions" were evidently not answered, it is immediately apparent that his statement here has been greatly exaggerated on the basis that his friend is unlikely to ever discover otherwise. This exaggeration continues further when Duffield refers to the "great pecuniary profit and universal praise I gained by this work" (249), given that any praise that may or may not have been heaped on his translation has not been documented. The cause of this self-aggrandisement is most likely explained by the date that *Recollections* was published: coming only four years after Ormsby's translation, when critical praise for it would still have been circulating in literary circles, it was most likely still a raw subject for Duffield to confront.

Nevertheless, it must also be said that the breakfast discussion between Duffield and his host also plugs a number of the knowledge gaps around his translation and background in Duffield's favour. It proves that he was familiar with Cervantes' biographical background, including his military career and time spent captive in Lepanto (1889: 234); he was aware of Avellaneda's version of *Don Quixote* and the anger Cervantes harboured towards it (236) and had even read it himself (242-45). There is no evidence to suggest that Watts also benefitted from any of these, which once again explains the difference in critical reception that the two versions achieved. However, upon closer analysis it may well be too hasty to overestimate Duffield's grounding in *Don Quixote*. During their conversation, Don Fernando asks Duffield why Cervantes wrote the novel in the first place (234). Over the course of five entire pages, Duffield appears to answer the question but in fact simply skirts around the issue and in the end provides no clear reason. To set about translating any source text, but particularly one as complex and scrutinised as *Don Quixote*, without a clear understanding of the skopos and identity of it cannot ever result in a successful translation, something which is evident in the mixed success with which Duffield handles irony in his. In addition, the extent of Duffield's familiarity with the source text in general is also indirectly called into question by his travel journal. Throughout the whole book, including the final chapter which is entirely devoted to discussing *Don Quixote*, there are only three direct

references to or citations from the source text.<sup>233</sup> This strongly suggests that, although Duffield may have gained a firm understanding of the novel's reception and key themes, he was not overly familiar with finer details of the text itself.

#### 4. Irony's contribution to the debate over the existence of a Romantic *Don Quixote* during the nineteenth century

Unlike the previous critical assumptions discussed in the context of what my study has highlighted, critical opinion remains polarised over the question of whether or not a Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* was indeed ever appropriate, and whether or not it was still prevalent during the second half of the nineteenth century. Unamuno, Schlegel, Lockhart, Tieck, Marchena, Bowle, Fitzmaurice-Kelly and Ortega y Gasset, among others, have all contributed to the argument since the 1800s, that the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* and its protagonist is both justified and valid. On the other hand, Mandel, Close, Russell, and Nabokov rank among the modern critics who, having studied and explored the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote*, all remain of the opinion that it is not the correct way for Cervantes' masterpiece to be approached. Which of the two sides is correct in their point of view is unlikely to ever be decided, and Allen shares this view when he notes that opinion has and always will remain divided over this issue (2008: 11). Likewise, Johnson has observed that "*Don Quixote* has generated a body of critical commentary staggering not only in its sheer volume, but also in the number of totally incompatible interpretations and mind-boggling contradictions it offers" (1990: 102). What my study can answer, however, is the question of where the three nineteenth-century translations stand on the debate, on the basis of how each of them either upheld or introduced Romantic elements in their versions.

Two clear conclusions arise from the analysis of my data; firstly, all three of the translations produced in the final quarter of the nineteenth century, long after the Romantic period is traditionally regarded as being over, offer a translation of Cervantes' irony that is generally, if not consistently, conducive to a Romantic interpretation across the instances analysed. Though there were admittedly seven instances where none of the translations particularly lent themselves to a romantic interpretation, in the other eleven

---

<sup>233</sup> pages 16, 49 and 242.

such a rendering was offered by at least one of the translators and twice this was done unanimously by all three. Secondly, it is also notable that the three translators appear to do this on an equally frequent basis as each other, though not always at the same time.

As the two who exercised the greatest fidelity to the syntactic and formal aspects of the source text and its early seventeenth-century grounding, at the expense of fidelity to the spirit of it and its hidden messages,<sup>234</sup> one could be forgiven for thinking that Duffield's and Watts' versions would be the ones which lent themselves to the most romanticised interpretation. This would be inaccurate, and incidentally there was never one occasion when Watts was the only translator to recognise and retain a romantic reading of Cervantes' irony independently of the other two, further supporting my earlier discussion of his lack of originality and literary background. There is a critical parallel between a Romantic reading of *Don Quixote* and the protagonist's transition towards sanity, as it is over the course of his return to normality that the reader becomes more able to identify with him and the struggles he faces, which in turn leads on to increased pity and an urge to see the good in him and protect the noble yet vulnerable elderly man from the struggles he faces. As Allen has noted, Cervantes uses irony to show that Don Quixote's character embodies a manifestation of vice, in that he suffers as a result of these vices by becoming the victim of other characters' irony provoked by his vice (2008: 139-140) though, as discussed, this happens increasingly rarely as Part II progresses.

The apparently matching pairs of instances analysed in this study serve as excellent examples of the nineteenth-century translators' view of this shift, through the basis for direct comparison between Don Quixote's character at the two points in the story at which they occur. One key example of this is in the cases of the eighth and sixteenth instances analysed, both of which highlight the pervading doubt among Cervantes' contemporary society that a man can be both poor and good. None of the three nineteenth-century translators recognised in the sixth instance analysed that, as well as criticising snobbery and the confusion of the moral and monetary, Cervantes was also criticising the way such a view impacted on how he himself was regarded in his own life. When the same phrase made a parallel reappearance later in the sixteenth instance of irony, Duffield and Ormsby successfully produced a romantic portrayal of it through their recognition of the protagonist's progression from and ingénue to a conscious ironist. In the context of Don

---

<sup>234</sup> See the final paragraph of the introductory chapter to this thesis.

Quixote's character evolution, this showed that he was wise and increasingly self-aware, to the point where he is able to make others the victims and targets of his irony.

A further example of how Don Quixote's representation of vice progresses throughout the novel, in line with his transition to noble sanity, is visible in the final instance analysed. By offering Sancho money to take on his lashes instead of whipping himself, Don Quixote still manages to retain the noble qualities of a hero. Paradoxically, the explanation for this comes from one of the most staunchly anti-Romantic critics, who has previously stated that this approach is "misguided in each of its basic tendencies" (Close 1978: 3). Close explains that "whatever external incongruities there may be between the hero's Romantic behaviour and reality, internally his behaviour is noble." (1978: 238). Muecke has also stipulated, as part of his definition of situational irony, that "a person's words or behaviour are mockingly contradicted by their context" (1969: 42), and therefore it is important to consider Don Quixote's avoidance of self-flagellation in the context of his return to sanity and confirmation as a hero: throughout the novel his love for Dulcinea has been the reason for his need to emulate the ways of the knight-errants of a bygone era, which would include whipping himself here. By not doing so, it subtly proves to the reader that he is no longer so completely intent on trying to win her love, which indicates how near he is to being restored to his original sanity and regard among those around him. The closer Don Quixote edges towards that ultimate goal, the further he distances himself from the mad, chaotic fool presented at the start of the novel. Anti-Romantic critics argue that Don Quixote is never a noble hero, simply a mad man who is later cured and dies; Romantic critics on the other hand contend that he was never mad but simply misunderstood and persecuted as a result, an "average man placed in a less dignified situation than average" (Auden 2001: 73), or a "man of primitive resemblances" caught in a modern world in which "the cruel reason of identities and differences makes endless sport of signs and similitudes" (Foucault 1994: 39). There is no doubt that Don Quixote successfully underwent an overhaul of his character, and ends the novel as a wise and insightful man who will be greatly missed by those who cry at his deathbed. Each of the three nineteenth-century translators have upheld this. However, there is no discussion of where they stand on the Romantic debate in any of their accompanying paratexts. Beyond highlighting the fact that they have retained some features of identification with and sympathy for the protagonist, they have also at times offered a distinctly un-Romantic translation, and so there is very

little clear indication as to whether or not they personally considered *Don Quixote* a novel which should have been interpreted romantically in the 1880s.

Martínez Mata (2008), Ardila (2009a), Eisenberg (1987) and Cascardi (2002: 1-10) are some of the many critics who have argued that it was in fact Cervantes' intention from the outset of writing *Don Quixote* that as the novel progressed the reader should begin to see a deeper side to the protagonist, with whom they ultimately come to sympathise and no longer see only negative qualities. On one hand, it is true that imposing aspects or features onto a text which were not there previously, as many overly zealous Romantic critics have been accused of doing, ultimately places the original author's work at risk of being completely misinterpreted. Close sums up his concerns on this issue when he states that the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* and its sustained longevity "has pulled criticism directly away from the questions that the novel most obviously & naturally prompts" (1978: 2). However, at the other end of the scale the lack of rigidity in the critical thinking among the most hard-lined adversaries of the Romantic reception of *Don Quixote* fails to allow for any acknowledgement of the complexity in Cervantes' intentions. It is in fact Close himself who highlights this complexity. He argues that each era is too influenced by factors and interests unique to its own age, and therefore critics must instead find "ways of looking at literature which presuppose that its meaning lies below the ostensible surface, for example various forms of symbolical criticism" (1978: 2-3). In *Don Quixote's* case a prime example of one such sub-surface meaning is the issue of what it was that Cervantes originally set out to do. The dominance of the comic and satire in critical thinking during the 17<sup>th</sup> and first part of the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries explains why Cervantes' deeper intentions for his novel were not detected. This is coupled with the fact that so little was known about Cervantes until the middle of the eighteenth century, and it was through gaining an increased insight into the man behind *Don Quixote* that critics began to gain an increasing insight into his style.<sup>235</sup> Taking Martínez Mata's view to be correct,<sup>236</sup> there emerges from my analysis a more moderated picture which takes on board aspects of both the Romantic and anti-Romantic view of how *Don Quixote* should be interpreted: that at the start of the novel a heavily romanticised reading of the novel was not intended to be employed, but

---

<sup>235</sup> See the second part of the introductory chapter to this thesis.

<sup>236</sup> The two major elements of his argument are that Cervantes was not only aware of the changing way in which he was portraying Don Quixote throughout the novel but also that through his ongoing dialogue with the reader from the very start he made them complicit in this. See Scham (2009: 242-245).

during the later stages of the knight's story such a reading was encouraged by the author. Although there is no concrete evidence to support this theory fully, it is undeniably true that the essence of Don Quixote's character and the qualities associated with his personality at the start of the novel lend themselves much less to a sympathetic, heroic portrayal than the man he is by the end of the novel.

In spite of the absence of a definitive answer to the question of whether or not Duffield, Ormsby and Watts were proponents or critics of the Romantic approach to interpreting *Don Quixote*, what can be safely inferred is that when writing their translations they unmistakably retained some aspects typical of the Romantic approach. When considered in a wider context, this suggests that this line of critical thinking had therefore lingered on well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and many critics do believe this to be the case.<sup>237</sup> The ongoing survival of the Romantic approach may explain the features of Romanticism retained in the earlier instances of the nineteenth-century translations analysed, and in the case of Watts it is also the most obvious explanation for his romanticised renderings of the later instances. However, when looking at these later instances there co-exists an equally valid explanation for the translation techniques used, especially in the case of Ormsby as the one who had the greatest knowledge and awareness of Cervantes' style, as it is likely that his romanticised translations reflects his realisation of Cervantes' overall intention.

Therefore, the conclusions which have arisen from my study in relation to Romanticism in the nineteenth-century translations of *Don Quixote* also support the existing critical assumptions held regarding the varying success of the three nineteenth-century translators. Moreover, they also support one of the three lines of argument among the key areas of ongoing debate in relation to *Don Quixote's* romantic reception, that of the hybrid or multifaceted reception. The fact that the translators did not offer a romanticised translation of the irony in all of the passages analysed clearly indicates that there were other theories and approaches at play, by which the translators were also exposed and influenced. Nevertheless, the fact that their translations did lend themselves to a Romantic

---

<sup>237</sup> Johnson alludes to the continuity of the impact of Romanticism on critical thinking around *Don Quixote* when she acknowledges that "major critical statements since 1900 have in the main been reworkings of the romantic interpretation" (1990: 27), Close cites a lecture given by Menéndez Pelayo in 1905 as an example (1978: 61) and Ortega y Gasset proved that Romantic thinking on *Don Quixote* was very much still alive by the third decade of the 20th century when he remarked that "lo que en él es anormal, ha sido y seguirá siendo normal en la humanidad" (1921: 178, my emphasis).

interpretation shows that this approach to literature was still very much alive towards the end of the nineteenth century.

##### 5. The Significance of irony's role in determining a twenty-first-century view of *Don Quixote*

I have so far discussed the way in which seventeenth and eighteenth-century critical studies of *Don Quixote* have provided a useful tool for understanding what it was that informed and shaped the nineteenth-century reception of the novel. In a similar way, by analysing the nineteenth-century reception of *Don Quixote* in England, this in turn contributes to the existing knowledge gap around why it was received the way it was in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Whether or not *Don Quixote* should be read as a comic or serious novel has long been a source of contention, and in relation to contemporary readers my research supports both approaches. However, the results of my study indicate that these two contrasting views run concurrently and not consecutively. When the reader first meets the protagonist, it is hard to imagine how anyone could oppose the view that he is at the very least deluded and completely out of touch with reality, and that the effect of observing this relationship between the knight and the people and world around him is anything but comic. As Russell has pointed out, "even today, readers of the book would admit that such an approach may be permissible, even if normally eschewed by serious critics." In particular he refers to the "tricks and hoaxes, with making sport of the protagonist, his squire, and many other characters", going on to remind his readers that "to produce laughter of this kind was, of course, all part of the author's intention", and "he tells us, the melancholic is to be made to laugh and he whose disposition is naturally merry is to be made to laugh louder." (1969: 312) Likewise, Johnson notes that in Part I "we know more than Don Quixote about what is happening to him" (1990: 45), which the protagonist illustrates not only through his behaviour in the Andrés and Haldudo episode, but also when he frequently begins to narrate the story to the reader when the narrator has already done so. In other words, "we are invited to see him as a fool" (ibid). Indeed, how the earlier stages of the book should be read has never been the subject of much disagreement.

In terms of the question around how the latter parts of the novel should be read, the nineteenth-century translations strongly support the view that what was once the comic tale of a crazy fool has by now evolved into a heartfelt and very real story of a lonely

man's recovery and imminent death. However, I would argue that this is not to be confused with the Romantic view of Don Quixote at the end of the novel, and nor is it without enduring comic elements that remain throughout. The protagonist has undeniably undergone a considerable journey of self-discovery and overcome his 'madness', or mental health difficulties, depending on the context of the generation in which critical discussions are held. Having the utmost respect for a character, feeling sorry for him, or feeling that one can relate to his story to each reader's own individual degree does not, however, equate to feeling that Don Quixote is a hero.

An further over-arching characteristic of the nineteenth-century translations towards the end of Part II is the way they invoke in their readers a desire to protect Don Quixote, presenting him as vulnerable. Although by this stage in the novel he is conscious of the relationship between himself and his surroundings and other characters, so much so that he is able to use this to his own ironic advantage as discussed, at no point does he become immune to the games the other characters play with him at his own expense. Comedy, therefore, still remains a feature. In the Doña Rodríguez episode, for example, Don Quixote is able to challenge the duke to fulfil his obligations but the *dueña* has only asked him for help in the first place because she believes him to be the knight-errant the others have tricked her into thinking he is. As Marianella has noted, this passage is one which should be considered "neither sad nor tragic. Cervantes does not intend it to be. The *dueña's* stupidity is too comic to permit viewing her as a tragic figure" (1979: 140). The key point to note here is that this is comedy, not in its flippant, buffoonish or light-hearted form, but its equally real yet deeper sense.

The recognition of the serious, whilst at the same time keeping the automatic incorporation of the Romantic at bay, nevertheless serves as a potential gateway for readers to infer their own Romantic reading of the second half of *Don Quixote*. This highlights the vastness of the scope for individual difference within the field of critical reception, as Johnson has noted when she points out that 'meaning' is not found in the text itself, but is a "function of the particular relationship that particular readers establish with it, the experience they bring to it, the codes which they refer to it, and the questions they ask it to answer." (1990: 103). Factors which are likely to affect each reader's experience of *Don Quixote* include how relevant the scholarly background from which that reader approaches the novel, how relevant the scholarly background is of the translator and what else is happening in the wider social, political and cultural environment of either the reader

or translator. This not only explains how such contrasting views as those held by the likes of Close and Unamuno are possible, but also how those who strongly propagate the Romantic approach to *Don Quixote* are able to find Romanticism in every aspect of it at which they look. Critical reception since the seventeenth century has now completed a full circle, and as the number of studies into how *Don Quixote* should be read increases there are still no clear answers, other than the increasing consensus that its reception at any given point in time should also be viewed as a reaction to the reception which came before.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adriaensen, B**, *La poética de la ironía en la obra tardía de Juan Goytisolo*, (Madrid: Verbum), 2007
- Agrawal, R R**, *The Medieval Revival and its Influence on the Romantic Movement*, (Abhinav), 1990
- Alford, S E**, *Irony and the Logic of the Romantic Imagination*, (New York: Peter Lang), 1984
- Alardo, J**, 'A Study of Melancholy in *Don Quixote*', in *Cervantes and Don Quixote: Proceedings of the Delhi Conference on Miguel de Cervantes*, ed. **V Maurya & I A Ayuso**, (Hyderabad: Emesco), 2008, pp. 163-180
- Allemann, B**, 'De l'ironie entant que principe littéraire', *Poétique*, Vol 36, 1978, pp. 385-98
- Allen, J J**,
- a. *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool? A Study in Narrative Technique*, (Gainesville: University of Florida Press), 1969
  - b. 'Smiles and Laughter in *Don Quixote*', in *Comparative Literature Studies – Urbana*, vol. 43 no. 4, 2006, pp. 515-531
  - c. *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool? Remixed*, (Newark: Juan de la Cuesta), 2008
- Almar, G**, *Don Quixote; or, The knight of the woeful countenance: A musical drama, in two acts*, (Oxford: Cumberland), 1833
- Álvarez, B & J Joque**, *Don Quixote in English: A Chronology*, (Michigan: University of Michigan), 2012
- Álvarez Calleja, M A**, 'La serie de traducciones del *Quijote* y su influencia en el desarrollo de la literatura inglesa', in Barrio Marco & Crespo Allué, 2007, pp. 499-504
- Antonio, N**, *Bibliotheca Hispana Nova*, second edition, 2 vols (Madrid), 1788
- Ardila, J A G**,
- a. *The Cervantean Heritage. Influence and Reception of Cervantes in Britain*, (London: Modern Humanities Research Association & Maney Publishing), 2009
  - b. *La novela picaresca en Europa* (Madrid: Visor), 2009
  - c. *Cervantes en Inglaterra: el Quijote y la novela inglesa del siglo XVIII* (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos), 2014
  - d. 'Introduction: Transnational Picaresque', *Philological Quarterly*, Vol. 89 No. 1, 2010
  - e. 'The Much Esteemed History of the Ever-Famous Knight Don Quixote de la Mancha (1699): El éxito editorial de una traducción abreviada inglesa', *Anales Cervantinos*, Vol. 41, 2009, pp. 135-165
  - f. 'Thomas D'Urfey y la recepción del *Quijote* en el siglo XVII inglés', *Hispanic Research Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2009, pp. 91-107
  - g. 'Las adaptaciones teatrales del *Quijote* en Inglaterra (del Siglo XVII al XIX)', *Anales Cervantinos*, Vol. 41, 2009, pp. 239-250
  - h. 'El *Quijote* en el teatro inglés del siglo XIX', *Anales Cervantinos*, Vol. 46 (2014), pp. 41-66
- Aristotle**, *The Works of Aristotle Translated into English*, ed. **W D Ross**, 12 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon), 1910-52
- Asensio, E**, *Itinerario del entremés*, (Madrid: Gredos), 1965
- Astrana Marín, L**, *Vida ejemplar y heroica de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra*, (Madrid: Instituto Editorial Reus), 1948-1958, 7 vols.
- Auden, W H**, 'The Ironic Hero: Some Reflections on *Don Quixote*', in *Cervantes' 'Don Quixote'*, in **H. Bloom** (ed.), 2004, pp. 73-81
- Auerbach, E**, *Mimesis*, trans. **W. Trask** (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 1953

- Avalle Arce, J B**, *Don Quijote como forma de vida*, (Valencia: Fundación Juan March-Castalia), 1976
- Avellaneda, A**, *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, ed. **Martín de Riquer**, 2 vols. (Madrid: Espasa Calpe), 1972
- Ayres, J**, *Sancho at Court; or, the Mock Governor. An Opera-Comedy, as it Was Designed to be Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury Lane*, (London: unknown), 1742
- Bailey, R**, *Nineteenth-Century English*, (University of Michigan Press), 1996
- Bal, M**. *Teoría de la narrativa*, (Madrid: Catedrá), 1987
- Ballart, P E**, *Ironia; la figuración irónica del discurso literario moderno*, (Barcelona: Quaderns Crema), 1994
- Barrio Marco, J M & M J Crespo Allué (eds.)**, *La huella de Cervantes y del Quijote en la cultura anglosajona*, (Valladolid: Buendía), 2007
- Baudelaire, C**, 'Qu'est-ce que le romantisme?', in *Ouvres Complètes*, ed. **Y G le Dantec**, (Paris: Gallimard), 1964
- Baugh, A C & T Cable**, *A History of the English Language, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*, (London: Routledge), 2002, pp. 296-351
- Behler, E**. *Irony and the Discourse of Modernity*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press), 1990
- Bell, A F G**,
- a. *Cervantes* (New York: Collier Books), 1961
  - b. 'The Wisdom of Don Quixote', *Books Abroad*, Vol. 21, No. 3, 1947, pp. 259-263
- Bell, M**, *Cambridge Companion to European Novelists*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2012
- Berrio, A G**, *A Theory of the Literary Text*, (New York: Walter De Gruyter), 1992
- Bewley, T**, 'Madness to Mental Illness. A History of the Royal College of Psychiatrists', *RCPsych Publications*, 2008
- Black, J (ed)**, *The Broadview Anthology of British Literature: Volume 5, The Victorian Era*, (Ontario: Broadview), 2012
- Bloom, H**,
- a. *Cervantes' 'Don Quixote'*, (Philadelphia: Chelsea House), 2004
  - b. 'The knight in the mirror', *The Guardian*, thirteenth December 2013  
<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2003/dec/13/classics.miguelcervantes>
- Booth, W**,
- a. 'The Self-Conscious Narrator in Comic Fiction before *Tristram Shandy*', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. 67, 1972, pp. 163-85
  - b. *A Rhetoric of Irony*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1974
- Bourke, C E & R J Quirk**, 'Andrés in *Don Quixote*: A Cervantine Picaro', *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 5 No.1, 1985, pp. 19-25
- Bouterwek, F**, *History of Spanish and Portuguese Literature*, trans. **Thomasina Ross**, 2 vols (London), 1823
- Bowie, A**, *From Romanticism to Critical Theory*, (London: Routledge), 1996
- Brantlinger, P**, *The Reading Lesson: The Threat of Mass Literacy in Nineteenth-Century British Fiction*, (Indiana: Indiana University Press), 1998
- Brink, A**, 'The Wrong Side of the Tapestry', *The Novel. Language and Narrative from Cervantes to Calvino*, (New York: New York Times Books), 1998, pp. 1-11
- Burton, A P**, 'Cervantes the man seen through English eyes in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* XLV, 1968, pp. 1-15
- Burton, R**, *Anatomy of Melancholy. What it Is, with All the Kinds, Causes, Symptomes, Prognostics, and Several Cures of it: in Three Partitions. With Yheir Several Sections*,

- Members, and Subsections, Philosophically, Medicinally, Historically Opened and Cut Up*, (reprinted London: Blake), 1838
- Butler, S**, *Prose Observations*, ed. **H de Quehen** (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 1979
- Byron, Lord A**, *The Poetical Works* (London: Henry Frowde), 1907
- Caballero, L M**, *Diccionario de la lengua Castellana, Tomo II*, (Madrid), 1864
- Calvert, A F**, *The Life of Cervantes, with Numerous Portraits and Reproductions from Early Editions of Don Quixote*, (London: J. Lane), 1905
- Cameron, K**, *Humour and History*, (Oxford: Intellect), 1993
- Canavaggio, J**,
- a. *Don Quixote, del libro al mito*, (Barcelona: Espasa), 2006
  - b. 'Alonso López Pinciano y la estética literaria de Cervantes en el *Quijote*', *Anales Cervantinos*, vol. 7, 1958, pp. 13-108
  - c. 'Cervantes en primera persona', *Journal of Hispanic Philology*, Vol. 2, 1977, pp. 35-44
- Candler Hayes, J**, 'Eighteenth-Century English Translations of *Don Quixote*', in Ardila (2009a), pp. 66-75
- Cascardi, A**, (ed.) *Cambridge Companion to Cervantes*, (London: Cambridge University Press), 2002
- Casalduero, J**, *Sentido y forma en el Quijote*, (Madrid: Ínsula), 1949
- Castro, A**,
- a. *El Pensamiento de Cervantes* (Madrid: Hernando), 1925, and as re-edited by **J Rodríguez Puértolas** (Barcelona: Noguer), 1972
  - b. 'Los prólogos al *Quijote*', *Revista de Filología Hispánica*, No. 3, 1941, pp. 314-338
- Carr, F**, *Who Wrote Don Quixote* (London: Xlibris Corporation), 2004
- Cervantes Saavedra, M**, *The Ingenious Knight Don Quixote de La Mancha*, trans. **A. J. Duffield**, (London: C Kegan Paul & Co.), 1881
- Cervantes Saavedra, M**, *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of la Mancha*, trans. **J. Ormsby**, 4 vols (London: Smith, Elder, and Co.), 1885
- Cervantes Saavedra, M**, *Don Quixote*, trans. **J. Ormsby** (Project Gutenberg) <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/996/pg996.html>
- Cervantes Saavedra, M**, *The history of the most renowned Don Quixote of Mancha and his trusty squire Sancho Panza now made English according to the humour of our modern language and adorned with copper plates by J. P.*, trans. by **John Phillips** (London: Thomas Hodgkin), 1687
- Cervantes Saavedra, M**, *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*, 1755, trans. **Tobias Smollett** (New York: Random House), 2001 (and also reprinted in 4 vols, 1761)
- Cervantes Saavedra, M**, *The History of the Renowned Don Quixote de la Mancha ... Translated from the original Spanish ... by Charles Henry Wilmot*, (Publisher Unknown) 1774
- Cervantes Saavedra, M**, *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of La Mancha*, trans. **Henry Edward Watts**, 5 vols (London: Bernard Quaritch), 1888
- Chaytor, H J**, *Dramatic Theory in Spain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1925
- Chrisafis, A**, 'Don Quixote is the world's best book say top authors', *The Guardian*, eighth May 2002 <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/may/08/humanities.books>
- Cicero, M T** *Seven Orations*, ed. **W B Gunnison & W S Harley** (London: Silver, Burdett and Company), 1912
- Close, A**,
- a. 'Don Quixote's love for Dulcinea: a study of Cervantine irony', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, Vol. 50 No. 3, 1973, pp.237-255
  - b. 'Sancho Panza: Wise Fool', *Modern Language Review*, vol. 68, 1973, pp. 344-57

- c. *The Romantic Approach to 'Don Quixote'*, (Cambridge University Press), 1978
  - d. *Cervantes and the Comic Mind of his Age*, (Oxford University Press), 2000
- Cobham-Brewer, E**, *Dictionary of Phrase and Fable: Giving the Derivation, Source, or Origin of Common Phrases, Allusions, and Words that Have a Tale to Tell*, (London: Henry and Altemus Company), 1870
- Colahan, C**, 'Shelton and the Farical Perception of *Don Quixote* in Seventeenth-Century Britain', in **Ardila** (2009a), pp. 61-65
- Colebrook, C**, *Irony. The New Critical Idiom*, (London and New York: Routledge), 2004
- Coleridge, H N**,
- a. *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare and Some of the Old Poets and Dramatists with Other Literary Remains of S. T. Coleridge, Vol II*, (London: William Pickering), 1849
  - b. *The Literary Remains of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, (London: Pickering), 1836
- Coleridge, S T**,
- a. 'Unpublished Fragments on Aesthetics', ed. **T M Raysor**, *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 22, 1925, pp. 532-533
  - b. **S T**, *Lectures, 1808–19: On Literature*, ed. **R. A. Foakes** (Princeton University Press), 1987
- Coromines i Calders, D**.
- a. 'A proposed methodology for analysing the translation of prose fiction texts with a narratively bound ironic component', in **Lievois & Schoentjes** (2010) pp. 63-98
  - b. 'Les divergències d'intensitat en la traducció d'emocions i actituds: L'enuig i la ironia a les versions catalana i castellana de l'obra *Unkenkrufe*, in **V. Alsina, G. Andújar & M. Tricás**, *La representación del discurso individual en traducción*, (Frankfurt: Peter Lang), pp. 86-104, 2009
- Cottingham, J**, *The Cambridge Companion to Descartes*, (London: Cambridge University Press), 1992
- Covarrubias, S**, *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*, (Madrid: Luís Sánchez), 1611
- Cox, S**, 'The Cervantean Heritage: Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain', *Cervantes*, 30, 1, 2010, pp. 209-212
- Cro, S**, 'The American Sources in Cervantes and Defoe', in **Ardila** (2009a), pp. 117-123
- Cuddon, J A**, *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, (London: Penguin), 1991
- Curran, S**, *Poetic Form and British Romanticism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1986
- Dane, J**. *The Critical Mythology of Irony*, (Georgia: University of Georgia), 1991
- Daunton, M J**, *Progress and Poverty: An Economic and Social History of Britain 1700-1850*, (London: Oxford University Press), 1995
- De Bruyn, F**,
- a. 'Hooking the Leviathan: the eclipse of the heroic and the emergence of the sublime in eighteenth-century British literature', *The eighteenth Century*, Vol. 28 No.3, 1987, pp. 195-213
  - b. 'The Critical Reception of *Don Quixote* in England 1605-1900', in **Ardila** (2009a), pp. 32-53
- Delabatista, D**, 'Literary Studies and Translation Studies', in **Gambier & Doorslater** (2010), pp. 196-208
- De la Bédoyère, C**, *The Discovery of DNA*, (London: Evans), 2005
- De los Ríos, V**, 'Análisis del Quijote' as part of his Introduction to the *RAE* edition of *Don Quijote*, 1780

- de Man, P**, *Blindness and Insight*, (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press), 1983
- de Riquer, M**, *Nueva aproximación al 'Quijote'*, (Barcelona: Teide), 1989
- d'Haen, T & R Dhond.**, 'International Don Quixote', *Textet Studies in Comparative Literature*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi), 2009
- De Wilde, J**. 'The analysis of translated literary irony: some methodological issues', in **Lievois K. & P. Schoentjes**, *Translating Irony*, pp.25-44
- Díaz de Benjumea, N**,
- a. 'Comentarios filosóficos del *Quijote*', a series of 9 articles in *La América* (Crónica Hispano-Americana), 8<sup>th</sup> August – 24<sup>th</sup> December 1859.
  - b. *La verdad sobre el Quijote. Novísima historia crítica de la vida de Cervantes* (Madrid), 1878
- Dolder, E**, *Henry Fielding's Don Quixote in England*, (Zurich: Buchdruckerei Gebr. Leeman & Co.), 1907
- Dominguez Ortíz, A**, *La sociedad española en el siglo xvii*, (Madrid: CSIC), 1963, 2 vols.
- Donahue, D**, 'Cervantes as Romantic Hero and Author: Mary Shelley's *Life of Cervantes*', in **Ardila** (2009a), pp. 181-189
- Drabble, M**, *Oxford Companion to English Literature*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1985
- Driggers, S**, 'The Importance of Quixotism on the Philosophy of Miguel de Unamuno', *TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange*, (Knoxville: University of Tennessee), 2011, pp. 1-36
- Duckworth, A M**, 'Quixotic Reflections', *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 3 No. 1, 1983, pp. 65-77
- Duffield, A J**,
- a. *The Ingenious Knight Don Quixote de la Mancha, A New Translation from the Originals of 1605 and 1608, with some notes of Bowle, J. A. Pellicer, Clemencin and others*, (London: Kegan Paul), 1881
  - b. *Don Quixote, his Critics and Commentators, with a brief Account of the Minor Works of Cervantes and a Statement of the Aim of the greatest of them all*, (London: C. K. Paul), 1881
  - c. *Recollections of Travels Abroad*, (London: Remington & Co.), 1889
- Durán, M**, *La ambigüedad en el Quijote* (Xalapa: Universidad Veracruzana), 1960
- D'Urfey, T**, *The Comical History of Don Quixote: as it was acted at the Queen's Theatre in Dorset Garden by Their Majesties servants*, (London: Darby, Bettesworth & Clay), 1694
- Eco, U**, *The Limits of Interpretation*, (London: John Wiley & Sons), 1990
- Efron, A**, *Don Quixote and the Dulcineated World*, (Austin: University of Texas Press), 1971
- Egginton, W**, 'Cervantes, Romantic Irony and the Making of Reality', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 117 No. 5, 2002, pp. 1040-1068
- Eisenberg, D**,
- a. 'Teaching *Don Quixote* as a funny book', *Approaches to Teaching 'Don Quixote'*, ed. Richard Bjornson (New York: Modern Language Association of America), 1984 (reprinted in 2002), pp. 62-68
  - b. 'Teaching *Don Quixote* as a funny book', in *Approaches to Teaching Don Quixote* (ed. R. Bjornson), (New York: Modern Languages Association of America), 1984, pp. 62-68
  - c. *A Study of 'Don Quixote'*, (Newark: Juan de la Cuesta), 1987
  - d. 'Cervantes, Lope and Avellaneda', *Estudios cervantinos* (Barcelona: Sirmio), 1991
- Eisner, E**, *Nineteenth-Century Poetry and Literary Celebrity*, (London: AIAA), 2009
- El Saffar, R**,

- a. 'The Function of the Fictional Narrator in *Don Quixote*', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 83 No. 2, 1968, pp. 164-177
  - b. Review of Close, *Cervantes and the Romantic Approach to 'Don Quixote'*, *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 94, No. 2, Hispanic Issue, 1979, pp. 399-405
- 'Concerning Change, Continuity and Other Critical Matters: A Reading of John J. Allen's *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool?*', *Journal of Hispanic Philology*, Vol. 4, 1980, pp. 237-254
- Esterhammer, A**, 'Cognitive Process, Commanding Genius, and Comparative Literature', *Coleridge Bulletin, New Series*, No. 16, 2000, pp. 56-62
- Fernández, R & A Rodríguez**, 'Sobre el 'cuento' de la dueña dolorida', *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, No. 35, 1987, pp. 287-291
- Fernández-Morera, D & M Hanke**, (ed.), *Cervantes in the English-speaking World: New Essays*, (Barcelona: Kassel), 2005
- Feinstein, C H**, 'Pessimism Perpetuated: Real Wages and the Standard of Living in Britain during and after the Industrial Revolution', *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 8 No. 3, 1998, pp. 625-658
- Fitzmaurice Kelly, J**,
- a. *The Life of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, a Biographical, Literary, and Historical Study, with a Tentative Bibliography from 1585 to 1892, and an Annotated Appendix on the "Canto de Calíope"*, (London: Chapman and Halle), 1892
  - b. *History of Spanish Literature*, (London: Heineman), 1898
  - c. *Tercentenary of Don Quixote: Cervantes In England*, (London: British Academy), 1905
  - d. *Don Quixote / by Miguel De Cervantes Saavedra ; translated by Charles Jarvis ; edited with notes and an introduction by James Fitzmaurice-Kelly*, (London: H. Frowde), 1907
  - e. *Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra: a memoir*, (Oxford: Clarendon), 1913
- Flores, R M**, *Sancho Panza Through Three Hundred and Seventy-Five Years of Continuations, Imitations and Criticism, 1605-1980*, (Newark: Juan De La Cuesta), 1982
- Flynn, L J**, 'The *De Arte Rhetorica* of Cyprian Soarez', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Vol. 42, 1956
- Foucault, M**, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, (New York: Random House Vintage), 1994
- Frazier, H C**, *A Bubble of Ancestral Voices: Shakespeare, Cervantes & Theobald*, (The Hague: Mouton), 1974
- Fries, C C**, *The Structure of English: An Introduction to the Construction of English Sentences*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co.), 1952
- Gaddis Rose, M**, *Translation and Literary Criticism*, (Manchester: St Jerome), 1997
- Gambier, Y & L Van Doorslater** (eds), *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Vol. 1, (Philadelphia: John Benjamins), 2010
- Garber, F**, *Romantic Irony*, Vol. 2, (Philadelphia: John Benjamins), 1988
- Garrido Gallardo, M A**, 'Ironía', *Gran Enciclopedia Cervantina*, ed. **Carlos Alvar**, (Madrid: Castalia), vol. 7, 2010, pp. 6299-6303
- Gerli, E M**, "'Pray, Landlord, bring me those books": Notes on Cervantes, Walter Scott, and the Ethical Legitimacy of the Novel in Early Nineteenth-Century England.', in *Córónete tus hazañas: Studies in Honor of John Jay Allen*, ed. **McGrath**, (Newark: Juan de la Cuesta), 2005, pp. 231-243.
- Glicksberg, C I**, *The Ironic Vision in Modern Literature*, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff), 1969
- Görlach, M**, *English in nineteenth-century England: an introduction*, (London: Cambridge University Press), 1999

- Grabo, N S**, 'Running The Gauntlet: Seventeenth-Century Literary Criticism', *ELH*, Vol. 67 No. 3, 2000, pp. 697-715
- Graf, E C**, *Cervantes and Modernity*, (New Jersey: Bucknell University Press), 2007
- Grice, H. P.** 'Logic and Conversation', in **P. Cole & J. L. Morgan**, *Syntax and Semantics 3*, 1975, pp. 41-58
- Guyer, P**, (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Kant's 'Critique of Pure Reason'*, (New York: Cambridge University Press), 2010
- Hallam, H**, *Introduction to the Literature of Europe, in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and seventeenth Centuries*, 3 vols (London: John Murray), 1839
- Halverson, S.** 'The concept of equivalence in translation studies: Much ado about something', *Target*, Vol 9 No. 2, 1997, pp. 207-233
- Hamilton, F**,
- a. Review of Merkl, *Cervantes anti-sofista: Sobre Platón, Ficino y los tres Quijotes (1605, 1614 y 1615)*, *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, Vol. 89 No.7, 2012, pp. 789-790
  - b. 'Author Chronology: Miguel de Cervantes', *Literary Encyclopedia*, 2012, [www.litencyc.com/php/newlifeline.php?id\\_author\\_0=806](http://www.litencyc.com/php/newlifeline.php?id_author_0=806)
- Hammond, B**, 'The Cervantic Legacy in the Eighteenth-Century Novel', in **Ardila** (2009a), pp. 96-105
- Hamon, P**, *L'ironie litteraire: Essai sur les formes de l'écriture oblique*, (Paris: Hachette), 1996
- Harmon, W**, *Classic Writings on Poetry*, (New York: Columbia University Press), 2005
- Harmon, W & C H Holman**, *A Handbook to Literature. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*, (California: Macmillan), 1992
- Hart, T R**, 'Review, Cervantes, Miguel de. *The Adventures of Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Translated by Tobias Smollett with an introduction by Carlos Fuentes', *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 8, No.1, 1988, pp. 118-122
- Hazlitt, W**, *Lectures on the English Comic Writers*, in *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. P. P. Howe, 21 vols (London and Toronto: Dent), 1931
- Herrero, J**, 'The Beheading of the Giant: An Obscene Metaphor in *Don Quixote*', *Revista hispanica moderna*, Vol. 39, 1976-77, pp. 141-149
- Highet, G**, *Anatomy of Satire*, (New York: Princeton University Press), 1963
- Hilton, R**, 'Four Centuries of Cervantes: the Historical Anatomy of a Best-Selling Masterpiece', *Hispania*, Vol. 30 No. 3, 1947, pp. 310-320
- Hughes, C E**, 'Duffield, Alexander James', *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900, 1901 Supplement*, (London: Smither, Elder & Co.), 1901
- Hutcheon, L**,
- a. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*, (London: Routledge), 1994
  - b. 'Irony, Nostalgia and the Postmodern', (Toronto: University of Toronto), 1998 <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/utel/criticism/hutchinp.html>
- Infantes, V**, 'La prosa de ficción Renacentista: entre los géneros literario y el género editorial', in **Antonio Vilanova** (ed.), *Actas del X Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*, Barcelona, vol. 1, 1989, pp. 467-474
- Ives, M C** *George Meredith's Essay on Comedy and Other New Quarterly Magazine Publication: A Critical Edition*, (Bucknell University Press), 1998
- Jaksić, I**, 'Don Quixote's Encounter with Technology', *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 14, No.1, 1994, pp. 75-95
- Jarvis, C**, *The Life and Exploits of the ingenious gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha. Translated from the Original Spanish of Miguel Cervantes de Saavedra*, second edition, 2 vols (London: Tonson and Dodsley), 1749

- Jiménez Panesso, D**, 'Sobre *La teoría de la novela*', *Folio*, (Colombia: Universidad Nacional Pedagógica), No.2, 1991,  
[http://www.pedagogica.edu.co/storage/folios/articulos/fo102\\_08arti.pdf](http://www.pedagogica.edu.co/storage/folios/articulos/fo102_08arti.pdf)
- Johnson, C B**, *Don Quixote. The Quest for Modern Fiction*, (Illinois: Waveland), 1990
- Johnson, S & H J Todd**, *Dictionary of the English Language. And an English Grammar*, (London: Longman, Hurst, Reese & Orme), 1805
- Joly, M**, 'Ainsi parlait Sancho Pança', *Les Langues Néo-Latines*, No. 215, 1975, pp. 3-37
- Jones, J R**, 'Introduction', in *Don Quixote, The Ormsby Translation, Revised, Backgrounds and Sources*, ed. **J R Jones & K R Douglas**, (New York: W. W. Norton), 1980
- Jones, S**, 'Hazlitt's Quotations from *Hudibras* and *Don Quixote*', *The Review of English Studies, New Series*, Vol. 43, No. 172. 1992, pp. 488-497
- Koster, C**. 'The translator in between texts: On the textual presence of the translator as an issue in the methodology of comparative translation description', in **A. Riccardi**, *Translation Studies*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2002, pp. 24-37
- Kern, J B**, *Dramatic Satire in the Age of Walpole 1720-1750*, (Iowa: Iowa State University Press), 1976
- Kierkegaard, S**, *The sickness unto death*, trans. **W Lowrie**, (Princeton University Press), 1946
- Kornbluh, A**, 'The Economic Problem of Sympathy: parabasis, interest and realist form in *Middlemarch*', *ELH*, vol. 77 no. 4, 1991, pp.941-967
- Knowles, E B**, 'Cervantes and English Literature', in *Cervantes across the Centuries*, ed. **A Flores and M J Benardete** (New York: Dryden Press), 1947, pp. 267-93
- Knowles, J & J M Armistead**, 'Thomas D'Urfey and Three Centuries of Critical Response', *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700*, Vol. 8 No 2, (1984), pp. 72-80
- Knox, D**, *Ironía: Medieval and Renaissance Ideas on Irony*, (New York: E. J. Brill), 1988
- Knox, N**, 'On the Classification of Ironies', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 70, 1972, pp.52-62
- Lapp, R K**, *Contest for Cultural Authority: Hazlitt, Coleridge, and the Distresses of the Regency*, (Wayne State University Press), 1999
- Lefebvre, H**, *Introduction to Modernity*, trans. J. Moore, (London: Verso), 1995
- Lewis, C S**, *The Discarded Image*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 1964
- Levin, H**, 'The Example of Cervantes', in *Contexts of Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1957, pp. 79-96
- Lesser, Z**, 'Walter Burre's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*', *English Literature Renaissance*, Vol. 29 No. 1, 1999, pp. 22-43
- Lievois, K & P Schoentjes**, *Translating Irony*, (Antwerp: Artesis University College), 2010
- Linder, D**. 'Translating irony in Popular Fiction: Dashiell Hammett's *The Maltese Falcon*, in **Lievois & Schoentjes** (2010), pp. 119-134
- Lindert, P H & J G Williamson**, 'English Workers' Living Standards During the Industrial Revolution: A New Look', *Economic History Review*, Vol. 36 No. 1, 1983, pp. 1-25
- Linn, A**, 'English Grammar Writing', *Handbook of English Linguistics*, (London: Wiley-Blackwell), 2006, pp. 72-92
- Lovejoy, A O**, *Essays in the history of ideas* (Baltimore), 1948
- Lowndes, W T**, *The Biographer's Manual of English Literature*, ed. **H G Bohn**, (London: Bohn), 1862
- Lo Ré, A G**, 'A reply to P. E. Russell's comments on the expression "El Caballero de la Triste Figura"', *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1992, pp. 225-30
- Lukács, G**, *Teoría de la novela*, (Barcelona), 1977
- Luteran, P**, *Six French and English Translations of 'Don Quixote' Compared: a study in the history of translation theory*, (New York: Edwin Mellen Press), 2010

- Luttikhuizen, F**, 'Englishing Cervantes' *Exemplary Novels*, in Ardila, J. A. G. (2009a), pp. 84-95
- MacKail, J W**, *Latin Literature*, (London : Kessinger), 2004
- MacLean, G**, *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: literature, drama, history*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1995
- Madariaga, S de**, '*Don Quixote*': *An Introductory Essay in Psychology*, (London: Oxford University Press), 1961
- Mancing, H**, 'Cide Hamete Benengeli vs. Miguel de Cervantes: The Metafictional Dialectic of *Don Quixote*', *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 1, No. 1-2, 1981, pp. 63-81
- a. *The Chivalric World of Don Quixote. Style, Structure and Narrative Technique*, (Columbia & London: University of Missouri Press), 1982
  - b. 'The Quixotic Novel in British Fiction of the nineteenth and Twentieth Century', in **J. A. G. Ardila** (2009a), pp. 104-116
  - c. *Cervantes Enciclopedia*, Vol. 2, (London: Greenwood), 2003
- Mandel, O**, 'The Function of the Norm in *Don Quixote*', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 55, 1958, pp. 154-163
- Mann, N**, *The Origins of Humanism*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1996
- Makaryk, I R**, *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 1993
- Maravall, J A**, *Utopía y contrautopía en el 'Quijote'*, (Santiago de Compostela: Pico Sacro), 1976
- Marchena, J**, *Lecciones de filosofía moral y elocuencia*, 2 vols (Bordeaux: Pedro Beaume), 1820
- Marianella, C H**, "*Dueñas*" y "*Doncellas*": *A Study of the "Doña Rodríguez Episode in 'Don Quixote'*, (North Carolina: Chapel Hill), 1979
- Martínes Mata, E**, *Cervantes Comenta el Quijote*, (Madrid: Cátedra), 2008
- Marín, N**, *Estudios literarios sobre el Siglo de Oro*, (Granada: Universidad de Granada), 1988
- Mayo, A & Ardila, J A G** 'The English Translations of Cervantes' Works Across the Centuries', in **Ardila**, (2009a), pp. 54-60
- McGann, J**,
- a. 'Rethinking Romanticism', *ELH*, Vol. 59 No. 3, 1992, pp. 735-754
  - b. *The Romantic Ideology. A Critical Investigation*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1985
- McGavran, J H (Jnr)**, *Romanticism and Children's Literature in Nineteenth-Century England*, (Athens: University of Georgia Press), 1991
- McGrath, M**, 'The Modern Translations of *Don Quixote* in Britain', in **Ardila, J A G** (2009a), pp. 76-84
- Meister, P**, *Arthurian Literature and Christianity: Notes from the Twentieth Century*, (London: Routledge), 2013
- Menéndez Pelayo, M**, 'Interpretaciones del Quijote', in *Estudios de Crítica Literaria, Quinta Serie* (Madrid: Sucesores de Rivadeneyra), 1908, pp. 193-228
- Merritt Cox, R**, 'The Rev. John Bowle: The First Editor of *Don Quixote*', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 67, No. 1, 1970, pp. 103-115
- Middleton Raysor, T**, *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 1936
- Millán-Zaibert, E**, *Friedrich Schlegel and the Emergence of Romantic Philosophy* (SUNY Series, Intersections: Philosophy and Critical Theory), 2012
- Mitch, D**, 'The Spread of Literacy in Nineteenth-Century England', *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 43 No. 1, 1983, pp. 287-288

- Molho, M**, *Cervantes: raíces folklóricas*, (Madrid: Gredos), 1976
- Montgomery, J H**, *Don Quixote. Translated, with Notes*, (London: Hackett), 2009
- Moore, C B**, 'El carácter conflictivo del *locus amoenus* y de la Edad Dorada en el *Quijote*.', *Letras de Deusto*, Vol XXIII, 1993, pp. 129-135
- More, C**, *Understanding the Industrial Revolution*, (London: Routledge), 2000
- Morón Arroyo, C**, 'La ironía en el *Quijote*: la maestría de una obra maestra', *Actas del Congreso 'Cervantes, el Quijote y Andalucía'*, ed. **A Castro Díaz**, (Seville), 2007, pp. 111-136
- Morris, M L**, 'Re-called to Life: King Arthur's Return and the Body of the Past in Nineteenth-century England', *Arthuriana*, Vol. 21 No. 2, 2011, pp. 5-27
- Morrison, G E**, *Alonso Quixano, Otherwise Don Quixote. A Dramatization of the Novel of Cervantes, and Especially of Those Parts Which He Left Unwritten* (London: Elkin Mathews), 1895
- Mortensen, K P**, *The Time of Unrememberable Being: Wordsworth and The Sublime, 1787-1805*, (Denmark: Museum Tusulanum Press), 1998
- Motteux, P A**, *The History of the Renown'd Don Quixote De la Mancha. Written in Spanish by Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Translated from the Original by several Hands: and publish'd by Peter Motteux, Servant to his Majesty*, 2 vols (London: Sam Buckley), 1700
- Motteux, P A**, re-edited in 5 vols (Edinburgh, 1822), *Introduction by J G Lockhart*
- Muecke, D C**, *The Compass of Irony*, (London: Methuen), 1969
- Murillo, L A** 'Cervantes y el *Entremés de los romances*', *Actas del VIII Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*, eds. A. D. Kossoff et al., (Madrid: Estmo), 1986, pp. 353-357
- Nietzsche, F**, *The birth of tragedy and the genealogy of morals*, trans. **F Golfing**, (New York: Doubleday), 1990
- Oelsener, H**, 'Review: *The Life of Cervantes by A F Calvert*', *Modern Language Review*, Vol. 1 No. 4, (1906), pp. 352-353
- Onions, C T**, *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, (Oxford: Clarendon), 1966
- Oriel, C**, 'Narrative Levels and Fictionality of *Don Quijote*, I: Cardenio's Story', *Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 10 no. 2, 1990, pp. 55-71
- Orozco Diaz, E C**, *Cervantes y la novela del barroco*, (Granada: Universidad de Granada), 1992
- Ortega y Gasset, J**, *Meditaciones del Quijote*, second edition (Madrid), 1921
- Oswald, J**, *A dictionary of etymology of the English language: and of English synonymes and paronymes*, (London: Black), 1859
- Pardo, P J**,
- a. 'El Siglo de Oro del *Quijote* en la literatura inglesa 1740-1840', in Barrio Marco & Crespo Allué, 2007, pp. 133-158
  - b. 'Quijotismo victoriano: los *Quijotes* perdidos de la literatura inglesa, 1837-1901', in *Don Quijote en su periplo universal: aspectos de la recepción internacional de la novela cervantina*, ed. Hans-Christian Hagendorn, (Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha), 2011, pp. 363-387
- Parker, A A**,
- a. 'Fielding and the structure of *Don Quixote*', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1956, pp. 1-16
  - b. *Literature and the Delinquent: the picaresque novel in Spain and Europe, 1599-1753*, (Edinburgh University Press), 1967
- Parr, J**, *An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse* (Newark, Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta), 1988
- Parsons, T H**, *The British Imperial Century, 1815-1914: A World History Perspective*, (London: Rowman and Littlefield), 1999
- Paulson, R**,

- a. *Don Quixote in England: The Aesthetics of Laughter*, (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press), 1998
- b. *Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England*, (Newhaven: Yale University Press), 1967

**Pavel, T**, *The Lives of the Novel. A History*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press), 2013

**Pawl, A J**, 'Feminine Transformations of the *Quixote* in Eighteenth-Century England: Lennox's Female Quixote and her sisters', in **Ardila** (2009a), pp. 166-175

**Pérez de Ayala, R**, *Principios y finales de la novela (Fielding, Richardson, Dickens, Cervantes, Joyce, Maupassant, Carlyle, Lord Bacon)*, (Madrid: Taurus), 1958

**Phipps, A**, 'The web of society: Eliot's *Middlemarch* as a vehicle of reform', *Tennessee Philological Bulletin*, vol. 48, 2011, pp.17-26

**Piferrer, P**, *Clásicos españoles* (Barcelona: Tomás Gorchs), 1846

**Pilon, F**, *Barataria; or, Sancho Turn'd Governor*,(London: Lowndes), 1785

**Piper, A**, *Dreaming in Books: The Making of the Bibliographic Imagination in the Romantic Age*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 2009

**Potkay, A**, *The Passion for Happiness: Samuel Johnson and David Hume*, (New York: Cornell University Press), 2000

**Putnam, S**, *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote de La Mancha*, (New York: Viking Press), 1949

**Quintero, R**, *A Companion to Satire: Ancient and Modern*, (Oxford: Blackwell), 2008

**Randall, D B J & J C Boswell**, *Cervantes in England: The Tapestry Turned* (Oxford University Press), 2009

**Rauser, A F**, *Caricature Unmasked: Irony, Authenticity and Individualism in Eighteenth-century English Prints*, (Delaware: Associated University Press), 2008

**Reyner, E**, *Rules for the government of the Tongue*, (London: Thomas Newberry), 1656

**Riley, E C**,

- a. 'Episodio, novela y aventura en *Don Quijote*', in *Anales Cervantinos*, vol. 5, 1956, pp. 209-30
- b. *La teoría de la novela en Cervantes*, (Madrid: Taurus), 1966
- c. *Don Quixote*, (London: Allen & Unwin), 1986

**Rivers, E**, 'On the Prefatory Pages of *Don Quixote*, Part II', *Modern Language Notes*, No. 75, 1960, pp. 214-221

**Roger, L**, *The British Empire in the Middle East 1945-1951: Arab Nationalism, the United States and Post-war Imperialism*, (London: Oxford University Press), 1986

**Romiti, E**, *Literatura comparada: 'Don Quijote de la Mancha' & 'Comentarios Reales de los Incas'*, (Montevideo: Trilce), 1990

**Room, A**, *The Cassell Dictionary of World Histories*, (London: Cassell), 1999

**Rose, M**, *Parody and Meta-fiction* (London: Croom Helm), 1979; revised as *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Postmodern* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1993

**Roy, P**, *English Literature: The Historical Flow*, (Maharashtra: Laxmi), 2014

**Russell, P E**, 'Don Quixote as a funny book', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 64 No. 2, 1969, pp. 312-326

**Ruthven, K K**, *Faking Literature*, (London: Cambridge University Press), 2001

**Saglia, D**, *Poetic Castles in Spain: British Romanticism and Figurations of Iberia*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi), 2000

**Salazar Rincón, J**, *El mundo social del 'Quijote'*, (Madrid: Gredos), 1986

**Salillas, R**, 'La criminalidad y la penalidad en el *Quijote*', *El Ateneo de Madrid en el III centenario de la publicación de 'El ingenioso hidalgo'*, (Madrid: Imprenta de Bernardo Rodríguez), 1905, pp. 85-118

- Salomon, N**, *La campagne de Nouvelle-Castille à la fin du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Etudes), 1964
- Sánchez Escartín, E**, 'Las universidades menores y mayores. Una polémica en la Cataluña del siglo XVII', *Revista Pedralbes*, vol. 23, 2003, pp. 187-202
- Santoyo, J C**, *De Clásicos y Traducciones. Clásicos españoles en versiones inglesas: los siglos XVI y XVII*, (Barcelona: PPU), 1987
- Sham, M**, 'Emilio Martínez Mata. Cervantes comenta el "Quijote"', *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 29 No. 1, 2009, pp. 242-45
- Schelling, F W J**, *Philosophie der Kunst* in vol. v of *Sämmtliche Werke*, 14 vols (Munich: Stuttgart and Augsburg), 1856-9
- Schenk, H**, *The mind of the European Romantics*, (London), 1966
- Schlegel, A W**, *Sämmtliche Werke*, 14 vols (Leipzig: Weidmann), 1846
- Schlegel, F**, *Charakteristiken und Kritiken: I (1796-1801)*, ed. **Hans Eichner** (München: Ferdinand Schöningh), 1967
- Schlicke, P**, *Oxford Reader's Comparison to Dickens*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 2011
- Schmidt, R**,
- a. Review of José Manuel Lucía Megías's *Leer el Quijote en imágenes. Hacia una teoría de los modelos iconográficos*, in *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 29 no. 1, 2009, pp. 237-38
  - b. *Forms of Modernity. 'Don Quixote' and Modern Theories of the Novel*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 2011
- Schneider, E**, *The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt. A Study of the Philosophical Basis of his Criticism*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 1933
- Scodel, J**, 'Seventeenth-century English literary criticism: classical values, English texts and contexts', *The Renaissance*. ed. Norton, G. P. (Cambridge University Press), Vol. 5, 1999
- Searle, G R**, *Morality and the Market in Victorian Britain*, (London: Oxford University Press), 1998
- Secombe, T**, 'Ormsby, John', *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900, 1901 Supplement*, (London: Smith, Elder & Co.), 1901
- Sedwick, F G**, 'The Literary Movements Defined', *Hispania*, Vol. 37 No. 4, (December 1954), pp. 466-471
- Shaffer, E**, *Comparative Criticism: Volume 7, Boundaries of Literature*, (Cambridge University Press), 1986
- Shelley, P B**, 'A Defense of Poetry', in *The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, Volume 7, ed. **R Ingwen & W Peck**, (London), 1965
- Shelton, T**, *The History of the Valorous and Witty Knight-Errant Don Quixote of the Mancha. By Miguel de Cervantes, translated by Thomas Shelton*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1612
- Shiner Wilson, C & J Haefner**, *Re-visioning Romanticism: British Women Writers, 1776-1837*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 1994
- Sillars, S**, 'British Romanticism', in *The Literary Encyclopedia*, [[www.litencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=1225](http://www.litencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=1225)], 2008
- Simón Díaz, J**, *Bibliografía de la literatura hispánica*, vol. III (Madrid), 1970
- Simpson, W & M Jones**, *Europe 1783-1914*, (London: Routledge), 2013
- Sismonde de Sismondi, J C L**, *De la littérature du Midi de L'Europe*, (Paris), 1813, 4 vols.
- Skinner, J**, 'Don Quixote in eighteenth-Century England: A Reader Response', *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1987, pp. 45-57
- Smitterberg, E**, *The Progressive in nineteenth-century English: A Process of Integration*, (Amsterdam: Rodopi), 2005

- Soffer, R N**, 'Review of *Romanticism in Children's Literature*, by **J H McGavran**', *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 32 No. 4, (1992), pp. 544-546
- Sperber, D. & D. Wilson**, 'On verbal irony', *Lingua*, Vol 87 No. 1, 1992, pp.53-76
- Stavans, I**, 'One Master, Many Cervantes. *Don Quixote* in Translation', *Humanities*, Vol. 29 No. 5, 2008, pp. 22-27
- Staves, S** 'Don Quixote in Eighteenth-century England', *Comparative Literature*, Vol. 24 No. 3, 1972, pp. 193-215
- Stewart, Mrs M**, *Don Quixote; or, The Knight of la Mancha*, (London: unknown), 1834
- Strong, R**, *And When Did You Last See Your Father? The Victorian Painter and British History*, (London: Thames and Hudson), 1978
- Suárez, C**, *De Arte Rhetorica, Libri Tres*, (Gainesville: University of Florida), 1955. Originally published in 1568.
- Sullivan, H W**, Review of Close, *The Romantic Approach to 'Don Quixote'*, *Canadian Journal of Comparative Literature*, Vol. 7, 1980, pp. 114-18.
- Sullivan, R**, *A Dictionary of Derivations, Or, An Introduction to Etymology, on a New Plan, to which is Appended a Classical Spelling Book*, (London: Samuel Holdsworth), 1838
- Taur, J**, 'Don Quixote – Talmudist and Mucho Más', *Review of Rabbinic Judaism: Ancient, Medieval and Modern*, Vol. 4 no. 1, Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2001, pp. 139-157
- Tave, S M**, *The Amiable Humorist: A Study of the Comic Theory and Criticism of the eighteenth and Early nineteenth Centuries*, (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press), 1960
- Taylor, D**, *Mastering Social and Economic History Since 1760*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan), 1988
- Taylor, S K**, *Honor and Violence in Golden Age Spain*, (Boston: Yale University Press), 2008
- Ticknor, G**, *History of Spanish Literature*, 3 vols (London), 1849
- Tieck, J L**,
- a. *Kritische Schriften*, 4 vols (Leipzig), 1848
  - b. *Don Quixote von la Mancha: Leben und Taten des scharfsinnigen Edlen Don Quixote von la Mancha*, (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch) 2008
- Truman, R W**, 'Ormsby, John (1829–1895)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford University Press), 2004 ( <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20842> ), accessed ninth April 2014
- Twain, M**, *Life on the Mississippi*, (London: Chatto and Windus), 1883
- Twitchell, J B**, *Romantic Horizons: Aspects of the Sublime in English Poetry and Painting 1770-1850*, (Columbia: University of Missouri Press), 1983
- Tyson, L**, *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*, (London: Routledge), 2014
- Unamuno, M de**, *Vida de Don Quijote y Sancho, según Miguel de C. Saavedra, explicada y comentada* (Madrid: Colección Letras Hispánicas), 1905; reprinted 1987
- Ungerer, G**, 'The Earl of Southampton's Donation to the Bodleian in 1605 and its Spanish Books', *Bodleian Library Record*, Vol. 16, (1997)
- Urbina, E**, 'El caballero anciano en *Tristán de León* y *Don Quixote*, caballero cincuentón', *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, Vol. XXIX, 1980, pp. 164-172
- Van Leuven-Zwart, K**. 'Translation and original: Similarities and dissimilarities', *Target*, Vol 2 No. 1, 1989, pp. 151-181
- Vázquez de Prada Merino, M T** 'Ecos del *Quijote* en Charles Dickens', in **Barrio Marco & Crespo Allué**, 2007, pp. 197-208
- Venuti, L**,
- a. *The Translator's Invisibility*, (London and New York: Routledge), 1995
  - b. *The Translation Studies Reader*, Third Edition, (London and New York: Routledge), 2012

- Verdaguer, I**, *El Guzmán de Alfarache en Inglaterra: estudio de las diferentes versiones*, (Universitat de Barcelona: doctoral thesis), 1981
- Voltaire, J L**, *Letters Concerning the English Nation*, (London: Davis), 1741
- Von Koppenfels, W**, in *Cervantes in the English-speaking World: New Essays*, ed. **Fernández-Morera, D & Hanke, M**, (Barcelona: Kassel), 2005, pp. 25-42
- Voogd P J & J Neubauer**, *The Reception of Laurence Sterne in Europe*, 2004
- Wagschal, S**, 'Review of *Don Quixote: A New Translation, Backgrounds, Contexts and Criticism*, by Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Translated by Burton Raffel', *Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, Vol. 21 No. 1, 2001, pp. 147-151
- Wallace, M**, (ed.) *Enlightening Romanticism, romancing the enlightenment: British novels from 1750 to 1832*, (London: Ashgate), 2009
- Wardropper, B W**, 'Don Quixote: Story or History?', *Modern Philology*, Vol. 63 No. 1, 1965, pp. 1-11
- Weinbrot, H D**, *Eighteenth-Century Satire: Essays on Text and Context from Dryden to Peter Pindar*, (London: Cambridge University Press), 2007
- Weissbort, D & A Eysteinson**, *Translation – Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader*, (Oxford University Press), 2006
- Wellek, R**,
- a. *Concepts of Criticism*, (Harvard: Yale University Press), 1963
  - b. *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950*, Vol. 2, (London: Jonathan Cape) 1955
- Wiener, M J**, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2004
- Wilde, A**, 'Irony in the Postmodern Age: Towards a Map of Suspensiveness', *Boundary 2: A Journal of Postmodern Literature and Culture*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 5-46
- Williams, I**, *Sir Walter Scott on Novelists and Fiction*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul), 1968
- Williamson, E**,
- a. *The Halfway House of Fiction. Don Quixote and Arthurian Romance*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 1984
  - b. 'Romance and Realism in the Interpolated Stories of the *Quixote*', in *Anales Cervantinos*, vol. 2, 1982, pp. 43-67
- Wills, W G W**, *Don Quixote: in one Act*, (Massachusetts: Harvard University), 1895
- Wilson, E M**,
- a. *Spanish and English Literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth Centuries: studies in discretion, illusion and mutability*, (London: Cambridge University Press), 1980
  - b. 'Cervantes and English literature of the seventeenth century', *Bulletin Hispanique*, Vol. 50, No.1, 1948, pp. 27-52
  - c. **Wimsatt, W K and C Brooks**, *Literary criticism: A short history*, (New York), 1959
- Wood, S**, *Quixotic Fictions of the USA 1792-1815*, (Oxford University Press), 2005
- Woodard, B** 'Mad Speculation and Absolute Inhumanism: Lovecraft, Ligotti, and the Weirding of Philosophy', *Continent*, vol. 1 no. 1, 2011, pp. 3-13
- Wordsworth, W**,
- a. *The prelude*, ed. **E de Selincourt** (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1942
  - b. 'Preface', in *Lyrical Ballads*, ed. **R L Brett & A R Jones**, (London: Routledge), 1996
- Yong, H**, *Learning Spanish Words Through Etymology and Mnemonics*, (Indiana: Xlibris), 2016
- Zabalbeascoa, P**. 'Humor and translation: an interdisciplinary', *Humor*, Vol 18 No. 2, 2005, pp. 185-207