NAMES, Vol. 57 No. 1, March, 2009, 17–29

Naming and Translation/Naming in Translation: Toward a Close Reading of *Don Quijote* (Part I, Chapter I)

MARC CHARRON
University of Ottawa, Canada

This article examines the indeterminate nature of the different "acts of naming and non-naming" in the first chapter of Part One of *Don Quijote*. For example, there is much doubt surrounding Don Quijote's family name and place of origin. In other cases to be explored, the naming process is slightly more concrete, such as Don Quijote's naming after that of his horse, and the naming of the lady of his thoughts. The indeterminacy surrounding these acts is particularly interesting when examined from the perspective of the work's various translations, which each add an astonishing multiplicity of semantic possibilities. Four recent (i.e. from the last fifteen years) English translations will be studied with the objective of showing how different translators have confronted these ambiguous passages, and broaching the questions the translations themselves raise regarding these famous literary acts of naming.

KEYWORDS *Don Quijote* — recent English translations, Translating, Naming, Non-naming, Indeterminacy

Introduction

Naming in *Don Quijote* (*DQ* from now on) is to a large extent an uncertain business, especially in the first chapter of Part I of 1605. It is not so much a case of what the different names in the text mean, but rather what it means to name. Also, naming in *DQ* is not so much a question of asking if the narrator is up to the task, but rather if this narrator even takes this task seriously. It is a game of sorts, in which the reader is not at all sure of the origin of the names themselves, nor too sure of what the names properly mean — a question that has always been important to translators. If the names themselves in *DQ* are uncertain in so many ways, it is above all because the passages where naming is done are themselves the product of indeterminacy.

In concrete terms, the passages where naming is done — or, in some cases, undone? — are themselves full of ungrammaticalities, syntactic ambiguities, and general

 DOI 10.1179/175622709X402645

linguistic indeterminacy. Particularly from the point of view of translation, *naming in DQ* is considerably complicated by the fact that *naming* is in a way *translating*, in the sense that naming in the translations of *DQ* not only *raises questions about*, but also helps to *shed light on* naming as an interpretive act.

In this paper, I will look into the following four key *acts of naming* — but also *non-naming* — in the first chapter of *DQ* from the particular perspective of translation: first, I will discuss the very interesting case of the *unspecified* name of "the village or place in La Mancha where not long ago lived a *hidalgo* or gentleman . . ." who turns out to be the character we know as Don Quijote; second, I will examine in detail the *non-naming* of the hidalgo himself, that is, the offhanded manner in which the narrator practically eschews the question of naming the main character; third, I will address the issue of the resoluteness with which the hidalgo wants to name himself *after* his horse; finally, I will analyze the naming of the lady of the hidalgo's thoughts.

Traditionally, discussion about naming and translation in *DQ*, either by the translators themselves, or by the critics and commentators of recent translations of *DQ*, has focused on the challenges posed by certain proper names, mainly of characters, such as the narrator Cide Hamete Benengeli, or the Knight of the Sad Countenance (an epithet given to Don Quijote by Sancho Panza), etc. From a theoretical point of view, this discussion has yet to be thoroughly investigated, and those who have looked into the problem of the translation of proper names have, again, focused their studies mainly on the translation of the onomastic signifier and its signified and the challenge of carrying both into another language. But naming as a special type of ludic discourse in *DQ* poses other challenges to translation and also raises a few epistemological questions of its own.

Unwillingness to name, simple amnesia . . . or perhaps something else

The first act of naming worthy of close examination is the actual *erasure* of "the village or place in La Mancha where not long ago lived a gentleman" who, as we will see (and not without raising many doubts), will give himself the name of Don Quijote a few paragraphs later. Depending on the way the sentence is read, this first act of naming in Cervantes's novel is either characterized by the "unwillingness to name" or by "simple amnesia" . . . and then some.

Edward Dudley, who in *The Endless Text: Don Quixote and the Hermeneutics of Romance* (especially in a sub-chapter entitled "The Story of the Name and the Name of the Story") has given the most impressive analysis of what it means to name or give names in *DQ*, writes concerning this first act of naming:

> The first *erasure* (the *name of the village*) already establishes the existence of another text, one deliberately hidden by the narrator. In addition, since the language ("En un lugar de la Mancha" [In a place/village of La Mancha]) is an inherited narrative gesture, the introduction of the place establishes the village as a rhetorical haunting, rather than as a specific geographic location. (1997: 122; italics are mine)[1]

Given this point of view regarding the passage on *the name of the place/village* and its *erasure*, let us confront the following excerpt from a commentary on one of the recent English translations of *DQ*. Roger Gerald Moore (1998: 15) writes, in a self-proclaimed "post-modernist reading" of Burton Raffel's 1995 translation of *DQ*:

> Cide Hamete Benengeli [let us recall that *DQ* presents itself as a Spanish translation of an Arabic text written by a Moorish historian] was almost unwilling to mention his hero's place of origin by name. [. . .] When faced with a new translation of *Don Quixote*, the first thing to do [. . .] is to compare the translator's first sentence with those of the earlier translators.

Moore then looks at six versions of *DQ*'s opening line, from Thomas Shelton's 1612 translation to that of Walter Starkie in 1964. He notes that in each translation, the idea of either *not being willing to remember* or of *not being able to remember* is present.

Let us now compare the recent translations in English (from 1995, 2001, 2003 and 2005 respectively), preceded by the same first sentence in Cervantes' Spanish original:

> *En un lugar de la Mancha, de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme, no ha mucho tiempo que vivía un hidalgo de los de lanza en astillero, adarga antigua, rocín flaco y galgo corredor*. (Rico, 1998: 35)

> In a village in La Mancha (I don't want to bother you with its name) there lived, not very long ago, one of those gentlemen who keep a lance in the lance-rack, an ancient shield, a skinny old horse, and a fast greyhound. (Raffel, 1995: 13)

> In a village in La Mancha, the name of which I cannot quite recall, there lived not long ago one of those country gentlemen or hidalgos who keep a lance in a rack, an ancient leather shield, a scrawny hack and a greyhound for coursing. (Rutherford, 2001: 25)

> Somewhere in La Mancha, in a place whose name I do not care to remember, a gentleman lived not long ago, one of those who has a lance and ancient shield on a shelf and keeps a skinny nag and a greyhound for racing. (Grossman, 2003: 19)[2]

> In a village in La Mancha, whose name I don't quite remember, there lived not long ago an *hidalgo* of the kind who have a lance in the lance rack, an old shield, a lean nag, and a fleet greyhound. (Lathrop, 2005: 17)

In reference to the opening sentence of *DQ*, Moore (1998: 15) adds the following:

> One thing should immediately be clear, there is no single, set way of translating this sentence. Equally clear to a reader of Spanish is the use of *no quiero*, "I do not want; I do not wish": *de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme*," "whose name I do not wish to recall." This act of forgetfulness seems to be entirely deliberate, and the translation should surely express this fact.

Moore is not alone in criticizing Raffel's translation on this particular point. Steven Wagschal, an American Cervantes scholar, writes (2001: 149):

> [T]he opening sentence of Part I, which begins with the famously memorable phrase "En un lugar de la Mancha, de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme" (35) does not look or sound right as "In a village in La Mancha (I don't want to bother you with its name)" (13).

Strangely enough, Wagschal does not mention why he does not agree with Raffel's translation of the opening sentence. I would contend that *de cuyo nombre no quiero [. . .]* is ambiguous or, better still, that *de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme [. . .]* sets up an indeterminate act of naming because of the use of *no quiero* as an auxiliary. As Moore mentions, *de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme* can mean "whose name I do not want, I do not wish to remember." But if *no quiero* is considered exclusively from the point of view of its function as an auxiliary, then *de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme* means "whose name I refuse to remember" but also "whose name I am unable to remember," a possibility for which many translators over the centuries have also opted. However, *no quiero* can also include the meaning *no entro ahora en si me acuerdo o no*, that is, "I won't even get into the question right now of whether or not I remember." Such a possibility actually excludes the other two exclusive interpretations of the narrator having either memory problems or no wish to remember (that is, the two traditional interpretations given to the sentence over the centuries, including those of Rutherford, Grossman, and Lathrop).

By not choosing one definitive interpretation or, better said, by choosing at least two quasi-opposite interpretations of the first act of naming in *DQ* that no other English translator has chosen in 400 years, and by offering today's reader another interpretation of that first act of naming, Raffel's translation actually raises questions that have until now been ignored in the discussion of naming as an interpretive act. By doing so, Raffel's translation of what is likely world literature's most famous opening sentence adds to the critical debate on what it means to name in *DQ*. By having the narrator refuse even to address the question of whether or not the narrator remembers, Raffel's reading of the sentence actually challenges any future interpretation and translation of the first act of naming in *DQ*.

This erasure (for whatever reason) of the name of the village or place where everything begins is paralleled by a second act of indeterminate naming, this time concerning the name of the novel's main protagonist. For as Edward Dudley (1997: 125) writes:

> What is most remarkable of all is that this confusion occurs about the protagonist who became one of the most famous personages in all literature, but this only confirms the fact that the principal question to be asked should be: *Why* does this occur and what is the purpose of the persistent indeterminacy about the form of his name?

Again, I would like to insist that translation can and ought to be used to potentially answer such questions.

According to Dudley (1997: 126), this persistent indeterminacy holds its origins in a deliberate act of omission on the part of the narrator (which the translator must in turn interpret without going as far as to *undo*):

> The name of the hidalgo has become an instrument, a means toward creating a language of fiction, not merely a matter of creating an identity for the hidalgo. We see that even

> though his family is known in the village, by his neighbors, by Sancho's wife, and so on, the narrator never, in all the thousand pages of text, specifies the exact form of the name. This is a deliberate omission, an erasure, as was that of the name of the village.

At this point, let us turn to the second act of naming in the novel's first chapter, that of the naming — or more accurately the *non-naming* — of the *hidalgo* or gentleman himself mentioned in the opening line of the novel.

On the naming of the Quijote, or is it Quijada, or Quesada, or Quijana?

On the subject of the multiple forms of the hero's surname, Dudley's remarks (1997: 111–112) are extremely relevant:

> Much has been written about the hidalgo's *nom de guerre* and the prolonged confusion about his true *apellido*. Everyone knows him as Don Quixote, but the question of his original name is a notorious humanistic problem. Quijada, Quesada, Quejana are given as possible surnames in the opening paragraph of the work. [...] These variants do not occur as possible errata or authorial lapses of memory. Rather, the narrator specifies from the first that different *autores* give different inscriptions of the name (Riquer, *Aproximación* 76).

Dudley goes on to add (1997: 112–113):

> Thus, the result of all these inherited narrative gestures establishes the crucial existence of the "other texts" from which the editor claims to be working. One further procedure is that the work at hand brings into being a new linguistic artifact extrapolated from the *differences* found in other texts, which establishes a new language, not just a new story.

If such is the case, then it becomes extremely interesting to look at translation from that perspective, since translating a new language may end up being much more of a challenge than simply translating a story (which is associated with the traditional view of semantic translation). Finally, Dudley concludes (1997: 112–113):

> Among these procedures is the narrator's assumption that the form of the name must be *Quejana*, a word not found in the source text. It is an invention grounded in two previous forms, *Quijada* and *Quesada*.[3]

In fact, the passage in question reads in Spanish:

> *Quieren decir que tenía el sobrenombre de « Quijada », o « Quesada », que en esto hay alguna diferencia en los autores que deste caso escriben, aunque por conjeturas verisímiles se deja entender que se llamaba « Quijana ».*[4] (Rico, 1998: 36–37)

Before we look more closely at each of its different translations, a few comments on the overall indeterminacy of the Spanish original passage are in order. First of all, there seems to be some ambiguity surrounding the word *caso*. What, precisely, is the nature of this *caso*? There is imprecision here, and it is reflected in the different translations by the fact that the translators opt for the vague terms *subject* and *matter*. Secondly, the reader will notice the peculiar use of the present tense in

escriben, something only Grossman's translation reproduces; in fact, the past tense seems more logical in context which is obviously why all other translators make this choice.

More generally speaking, it could well be argued that, as far as the translated versions are concerned, the fundamental questions are, of course: Do the translations actually *try to tie together these loose ends* due to the imprecision (intended or not) on the part of the narrator? Do the recent translations of *DQ* try *to tidy up* the narrative or do they perpetuate the confusion even further, for example by introducing new translated forms of the *sobrenombre*?

In its recent English translations, the passage in question reads:

> It's said his family name was Quijada, or maybe Quesada: there's some disagreement among the writers who've discussed the matter. But more than likely his name was really Quejana. (Raffel, 1995: 13)

> His surname's said to have been Quixada, or Quesada (as if he were a jawbone, or a cheesescake): concerning this detail there's some discrepancy among the authors who have written on the subject, although a credible conjecture does suggest he might have been a plaintive Quexana. (Rutherford, 2001: 25)

> Some claim that his family name was Quixada, or Quexada, for there is a certain amount of disagreement among the authors who write of this matter, although reliable conjecture seems to indicate that his name was Quexana. (Grossman, 2003: 19–20)

> They say that his last name was Quijada or Quesada — for there's some difference of opinion among the authorities who write on this subject — although by credible conjecture we are led to believe that he was named Quejana. (Lathrop, 2005: 17–18)

Raffel's text gives no indication of the semantics of the particular surnames. However, in Rutherford's translation of the passage, the reader is given a *metalinguistic translation* (i.e. "as if he were a jawbone, or a cheesecake") of Don Quixote's surname Quixada or Quesada, but not so in the case of the expression "plaintive Quexana." Actually, it is not at all certain that, as in the case of Quixada and Quesada, the reader will understand the term "plaintive" to be a metalinguistic comment on the proper name Quexana.[5]

In the case of Grossman's version, the *sobrenombres* or family names themselves are very similar; there is never more than one letter differentiating them. The reader is thus led to imagine that the confusion is a more serious matter than it actually should be; the differences in the names in the original are important enough to point toward carelessness on the part of the narrator.

As far as Lathrop's text is concerned, the reader will wonder who, precisely, are "they" at the very opening of the passage. Notice also the very singular — perhaps subversive? — use of the term "authorities," giving the sentence a slight legalistic twist, where all others have used either "authors" or "writers."

All of the comments regarding the different translations and the multiplicity of interpretations point to the indeterminacy of the passage. On the subject of what we have called the *narrator's carelessness*, Dudley offers the following conclusion (1997: 114):

> In effect, the narrator seems to claim that all this worry about the name is not relevant to the meaning of his writing project, and he asserts that various forms of words exist but that he will proceed without bothering to verify which is the correct one. This is a subversive procedure with which to open a book since it challenges the idea of language as a system of signs representing an external reality.

At the same time, the representation of external reality through linguistic transfer is a *sine qua non* condition that must be fulfilled for the translation process to take place and be accomplished successfully. From that perspective, the study of these key passages in translation in which *naming is done* is clearly a profitable critical exercise.

On the will of Don Quijote to give himself a name after his horse

The third act of naming in the novel's opening chapter worthy of close attention — an act which escapes categorization, being in itself difficult to name — has much to do with Don Quijote's resolve to give himself a name *after* his horse, that is, in the logical sense of "after having named his horse." If read literally, however, it assumes the nonsensical interpretation of the horse becoming Quijote's namesake.

The passage where Don Quijote goes about this protracted task is expressed in the following manner in the original:

> *Puesto nombre, y tan a su gusto, a su caballo, quiso ponérsele a sí mismo, y este pensamiento duró otros ocho días, y al cabo se vino a llamar «don Quijote»; de donde, como queda dicho, tomaron ocasión los autores desta tan verderera historia que sin duda se debía llamar « Quijada », y no « Quesada », como otros quisieron decir.* (Rico, 1998: 42–43)

Again, there are many things about this passage which are of interest when considering its possible translation. To begin with, in the expression *quiso ponérsele*, one wonders to what *le* refers, grammatically speaking. To the name Don Quijote gave to his horse? Then, how should one go about translating the expression *este pensamiento*? How is this *non-expressed* thought to be translated? Another interesting aspect of this passage is the expression *los autores desta tan verderera historia*, in which there is an outright acknowledgment of there being more than one author to "this very true story;" nowhere else in the narrative is the idea of a plurality of authors put forward.[6] Actually, it is only if one considers Lathrop's very peculiar translation of an otherwise straightforward passage by the completely non-literal "experts in matters of this true history" that one realizes the indeterminacy surrounding *sentences where naming is taking place*. Next comes the expression *sin duda se debía llamar*. There is a certain irony here to have the narrator write this with such assuredness, when compared with the marked carelessness in the previous passage concerning the name of Quijote himself. Furthermore, notice how the phonetic similarity or dissimilarity of the original pair *Quijada*/*Quesada* in translation makes this claim even more suspect because of the very multiplicity of the forms, that is, considering all the translations. Of course, if one limits oneself to a single translation, the claim fully makes sense; it is again only in the comparison of the different versions

that one actually realizes to what extent the linguistic possibilities are more numerous than what the original strictly offers.

In its recent English translations, the passage in question reads:

> Having settled on such a fine name for his horse, he turned to himself, and spent eight more days thinking until, at last, he decided to call himself *Don Quijote* [*quijote* = thigh armor] — a plain fact which, as we have said, persuades the authors of this highly veracious history that, beyond any question, his family name must have been Quijada, rather than Quesada, as others have claimed. (Raffel, 1995: 16)

> Having given his horse a name, and one so much to his liking, he decided to give himself a name as well, and this problem kept him busy for another eight days, at the end of which he decided to call himself *Don Quixote*, that is, *Sir Thighpiece*, from which, as has already been observed, the authors of this most true history concluded that his surname must have been Quixada, and not Quesada as others had affirmed. (Rutherford, 2001: 28)

> Having given a name, and one so much to his liking, to his horse, he wanted to give one to himself, and he spent another eight days pondering this, and at last he called himself *Don Quixote*, which is why, as has been noted, the authors of this absolutely true history determined that he undoubtedly must have been named Quixada and not Quexada, as others have claimed. (Grossman, 2003: 23)

> Having given his horse a name so much to his pleasure, he wanted to give one to himself. These musings lasted another week, and finally he decided to call himself DON QUIXOTE,[7] which, as has been said, has lead experts in matters of this true history to declare that his original name must have been Quijada, and not Quesada, as others have claimed. (Lathrop, 2005: 22)

With the expressions "having settled on such a fine name for his horse" and "he turned to himself," Raffel avoids resorting to the expression "to give a name" in order to make very clear "he is giving himself a name like he gave his horse a name," something every other translation does. Notice his choice of the objective and universal "a fine name," intended to get the reader's approval, in contrast to the more subjective *un nombre tan a su gusto*, "a name so much to his liking." Also note how the indeterminate and abstract quality of "este pensamiento" is somewhat maintained by the present participle "thinking" in "he spent eight more days thinking." The reader might wonder to what "pensamiento" refers specifically. The reader might also find curious the metalinguistic commentary on the meaning of the proper noun in the text, in particular comments of the endnote type which are placed instead within the core of the text.

Using Raffel's text as a first example, we can see the extent to which the accumulation of indeterminate meanings in the original generates much impreciseness from the point of view of translation. The same indeterminacy can be found in Rutherford's translation of this passage. The indeterminate and abstract "este pensamiento" is rendered in this case by the more concrete "this problem"; the same concrete quality is also given to the text by Rutherford as he opts for "concluded" to render the uncertain meaning of "tomaron ocasión." The metalinguistic comment on the

name *Quixote* is even more bluntly presented here, that is, within the text itself and not between brackets as in Raffel's version.

As for Grossman's text, its third passage follows the original syntax even more than usual, especially at the beginning of the passage, but without going so far as to propose a nonsensical syntactical construction. The indeterminate and abstract "este pensamiento" is rendered by the more concrete "pondering this," that is, giving himself a name, while the uncertain meaning of "tomaron ocasión" is rendered by the very determinate "determined."

In Lathrop's version, we notice once again the use of paraphrase for explaining the proper name DON QUIXOTE which appears in capital letters, but this time as a footnote. We also notice the use of the term "experts" to translate *autores*, a very interesting non-literal choice that not only conveys a dimension of even more *authority* than does the term "authors," but as noted earlier, also avoids in this sole instance talking about *multiple authors as narrator*.

On the naming of the lady of Don Quijote's thoughts

Finally, the fourth and last *act of naming* in the first chapter of *DQ* is that of the *naming of the lady of the hidalgo's thoughts*, which reads in the Spanish version:

> *Y fue, a lo que se cree, que en un lugar cerca del suyo había una moza labradora de muy buen parecer, de quien él un tiempo anduvo enamorado, aunque, según se entiende, ella jamás lo supo ni le dio cata dello. Llamábase Aldonza Lorenzo, y a esta le pareció ser bien darle título de señora de sus pensamientos; y, buscándole nombre que no desdijese mucho del suyo y que tirase y se encaminase al de princesa y gran señora, vino a llamarla «Dulcinea del Toboso» porque era natural del Toboso: nombre, a su parecer, músico y peregrino y significativo, como todos los demás que a él y a sus cosas había puesto*. (Rico, 1998: 44)

Again, let us consider a few points about the passage itself before we look at its recent translations. First, the choice of the term *lugar* recalls the elusive use of the same term in the first sentence of the novel. According to Francisco Rico's footnote in which he admits to being unsure of the meaning of *ni le dio cata dello*, this expression could be read syntactically to mean either "nor did she not even give him proof of her good looks" or "nor did he show sign of that." Next, there is the expression *darle título de señora de sus pensamientos*, which literally means "he *gave her the title* of the lady of his thoughts" and *not* "he *called* her the lady of his thoughts,"[8] as Grossman would have it, which is strange especially since Grossman's translation is almost always more literal than the other three. Then there is *como todos los demás*, literally meaning "like all the others" or "like all the other names," which is what the four English translations have opted for, except that the expression is somewhat strange and perhaps even illogical, with Don Quijote having only, to this point in the narrative, named himself and his horse. Finally, one will perhaps wonder why the narrator uses the expression *y a sus cosas* as if there were many things he had named; even the word *cosas* in this instance is peculiar and imprecise, for this simple word that in just about any given context would almost automatically translate to "things"

is, as can be seen below, rendered by four different terms in our four English versions.

Those four translations of this final act of naming read:

> It turned out, according to some people, that not too far from where he lived there was a very pretty peasant girl, with whom he was supposed, once upon a time, to have been in love, although (as the story goes) she never knew it nor did he ever say a word to her. Her name was Aldonza Lorenzo, and he thought it a fine idea to bestow on her the title of Mistress of his Thoughts. Hunting for a name as good as the one he'd given himself, a name that would be appropriate for that princess and noble lady, he decided to call her *Dulcinea del Toboso* [toboso = limestone rock], since Toboso was where she came from. To him it seemed a singularly musical name, rare, full of meaning, like all the others he'd assigned to himself and everything that belonged to him. (Raffel, 1995: 16)

> The fact was — or so it is generally believed — that in a nearby village there lived a good-looking peasant girl, with whom he'd once been in love (although it appears that she was never aware of this love, about which he never told her). She was called Aldonza Lorenzo, and this was the woman upon whom it seemed appropriate to confer the title of the lady of his thoughts; and seeking a name with some affinity with his own, which would also suggest the name of a princess and a fine lady, he decided to call her *Dulcinea del Toboso*, because she was a native of El Toboso: a name that, in his opinion, was musical and meaningful, like all the other names he'd bestowed upon himself and his possessions. (Rutherford, 2001: 29)

> It is believed that in a nearby village there was a very attractive peasant girl with whom he had once been in love, although she, apparently, never knew or noticed. Her name was Aldonza Lorenzo, and he thought it a good idea to call her the lady of his thoughts, and searching for a name that would not differ significantly from his and would suggest and imply that of a princess and great lady, he decided to call her *Dulcinea of Toboso*, because she came from Toboso, a name, to his mind, that was musical and beautiful and filled with significance, as were all the others he had given to himself and everything pertaining to him. (Grossman, 2003: 23–24)

> It happened — as is generally thought — that in a nearby village there was a good-looking peasant lass with whom he'd been in love for some time, although she never knew or even suspected it. Her name was Aldonza Lorenzo, and it seemed fitting to him that she should have the title of mistress of his thoughts. And looking for a name for her that didn't differ much from her [*sic*][9] own, and which elevated itself and suggested and implied the name of a princess and a great lady, he came to call her DULCINEA DEL[10] TOBOSO,[11] — since she was from the village of El Toboso[12] — a name that in his opinion was both musical and original, charged with meaning, as were all the other names he'd given to himself and his belongings. (Lathrop, 2005: 23)

The first thing to say about Raffel's translation is that, contrary to the opening phrase, the precise term "village" is not used to render *lugar* in this passage, thus actually echoing, with his choice of the vague "not too far," Grossman's use of the place adverb in the opening passage, and by doing so initiating a translative dialogue of sorts. More uncertainty then hovers over the love of Don Quijote for Dulcinea in the

passage "a very pretty peasant girl, with whom *he was supposed, once upon a time*, to have been in love" (my emphasis). Also of interest is Raffel's choice of the term "Mistress," which somewhat eroticizes the text and is certainly not insignificant (e.g. from the point of view of a psychoanalytical reading). Raffel insists once again on the fineness of Don Quijote's name in "a name as good as the one he'd given himself," but overall the syntax of the sentence is such that it can either be the narrator or Don Quijote himself who thinks that way. Finally, let us mention that Raffel resorts to, once again, the use of metalinguistic parentheses to explain the *common* meaning of a *proper* noun, and even comments on the matter by way of the paraphrastic and very casual expression "since Toboso was where she came from."

Of course, we must not leave this passage without a discussion on *love*. There is *no doubt* in Rutherford's version that Don Quijote was once or ever in love with the lady of his thoughts. Interestingly, the text's characteristic uncertainty, which I have described throughout this discussion, is omitted in this case. In the Grossman version, the fact that Don Quijote was once in love is curiously expressed; the passage that says "she apparently never knew" seems obvious, but if "she apparently never noticed," could it simply be that "she never bothered to" or even that "she never cared to" notice, a subtle addition in the translation that is in tune with the overall uncertainty surrounding naming as a semiotic act in this first chapter of *DQ*. Finally, notice in Lathrop's text the extensive use of paraphrase in footnotes to the translation, in addition to the passage "she never suspected Don Quijote was in love with her," which would qualify as a *safe translation* that opts for a rewording of "she never knew Don Quijote was in love with her".[13]

Conclusion

By way of conclusion, it would be wise to remember Dudley's comments on the narrator's language which I have called the *act of naming* in *DQ*. Dudley writes (1997: 114):

> The important result of all this waffling establishes the ontology of the narrator's language as referential to other writing and, even more importantly, to his own writing agenda and to his own aesthetic concerns rather than to events in an external reality. He is saying in effect that he will name his characters and report their doings in the form and manner most suited to his storytelling procedures and, presumably, to his own search for meaning.

My contention here, of course, has especially been that the critical analysis of the translation of the acts of naming and non-naming in *DQ* must be able to account for "all this waffling" that seemingly goes beyond "events in an external reality." As we have seen, naming and thus *giving meaning* in the translations of *DQ* is not *always* carried out through the lens of coherence and the need for reassurance; the versions of expert and gifted translators like the ones we have examined in fine detail show this very clearly.

In short, differences in translation are not to be considered from a prescriptive point of view, that is, where one looks for the least inferior version of *DQ*. On the contrary, these differences must be examined from the perspective of how they are

semantically cumulative and how each fully participates in the game of the ongoing reinterpretation of Cervantes's classic text.

Acknowledgements

I am most grateful to Melanie Aubert and Christal Steck for their valuable comments on the text and help with its revision.

Notes

[1] Notice how Dudley, in his comment, refers to both "place" and "village" to translate the term *lugar*.

[2] Actually *lugar* is an imprecise term in context, as Dudley has shown. Accordingly, notice Grossman's rendering of the term by the very indeterminate adverb "somewhere," thus confirming in a way the position defended in this article with regard to the uncertain quality of the business of naming in *DQ*, but also introducing the idea of carelessness on the part of the narrator that will turn up again in the second passage analyzed here.

[3] Dudley speaks of the very possibility of words not found in the source text just as one would speak of *unfaithful* translation, which is precisely the point I wish to make with regard to the benefits of looking at translation for answers that cannot otherwise be found.

[4] The reader will have noticed that the spelling of Quijana/Quejana differs according to the Spanish edition. To give one example, Dudley quotes from the famous edition by Martín de Riquer, who writes Quejana and not Quijana (as does Rico). Interestingly, notice also that the same remark applies to the translated passages.

[5] The verb *quejar* literally means "to complain."

[6] Critics of *DQ* have seemingly not said much, if anything, about this curious use of the plural here.

[7] Lathrop adds the note: "*Quixote* refers to a piece of thigh armor."

[8] My emphasis here in both cases.

[9] However curious it may sound, such a translation (in which *suyo* can either mean "his own" or "her own" in the passage *buscándole nombre que no desdijese mucho del suyo*) is grammatically possible.

[10] Lathrop adds the note: "**Del** means *of the*, too."

[11] Lathrop adds the note: "Aldonza was associated with the name Dulce's 'sweet.'"

[12] Lathrop adds the note: "El Toboso is a town near Toledo. Today it has 2300 inhabitants, mostly engaged in farming and sheep raising."

[13] Perhaps the most interesting feature of Lathrop's translation here is the fact that the passage "there was a good-looking peasant lass *with whom he'd been in love for some time*" could very well mean that Don Quijote *was still* and not *had once been* or *had once upon a time been* in love with her. (Italics are mine.)

Bibliography

Cervantes, Miguel de. 1995. *Don Quijote: a new translation, backgrounds and contexts, criticism*. Trans. Burton Raffel, ed. Diana de Armas Wilson. New York: Norton.

Cervantes, Miguel de. 1998. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. Francisco Rico. 2 volumes + CD-Rom, Barcelona: Instituto Cervantes-Crítica.

Cervantes, Miguel de. 2001. *The Ingenious Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Trans. John Rutherford, intro. Roberto González Echevarría. New York: Penguin Books.

Cervantes, Miguel de. 2003. *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of la Mancha*. Trans. Edith Grossman. New York: HarperCollins.

Cervantes, Miguel de. 2005. *Don Quixote*. Trans. Tom Lathrop. Newark (Delaware): Juan de la Cuesta.

Dudley, Edward. 1997. *The Endless Text: Don Quixote and the Hermeneutics of Romance*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Moore, Roger Gerald. 1998. "'A Dog is a Dog is a Dog!' A Neo-Post-Modernist Reading (*Cum Grano Salis*) of Burton Raffel's New Translation of *Don Quijote*." *International Fiction Review* 25.1–2: 12–20.

Wagschal, Steven. 2001. "Review of Miguel de Cervantes, *The History of the Ingenious Gentleman Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Trans. Burton Raffel. New York: Norton, 1995." *Cervantes* 21.1: 147–152.

Notes on contributor

Marc Charron is a Professor at the School of Translation and Interpretation of the University of Ottawa. His research interests include contemporary translation studies, cultural adaptation, new media studies, and Hispanic literatures in translation. His current research deals especially with the recent English and French translations of *Don Quijote*.

Correspondence to: Prof. M. Charron, School of Translation and Interpretation, University of Ottawa, Arts Building, 70 Laurier Avenue East, 4th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5, Canada. Email: marc.charron@uottawa.ca.