

DON QUIXOTE IN TWO DIMENSIONS: TRANSLATION AND ADAPTATION.

DON QUIJOTE EN DOS DIMENSIONES: TRADUCCIÓN Y ADAPTACIÓN.



**Universidad
de Huelva**

FACULTAD DE HUMANIDADES

TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

**MIGUEL ÁNGEL MORENO VÁZQUEZ
DOBLE GRADO EN ESTUDIOS INGLESES Y FILOLOGÍA HISPÁNICA
TUTOR/A: ZENÓN LUIS MARTÍNEZ Y SERGIO FERNÁNDEZ
2 DE SEPTIEMBRE DE 2016
CONVOCATORIA DE SEPTIEMBRE**

RESUMEN

En este trabajo estudiaremos dos traducciones inglesas del Quijote hechas en el siglo XVII. La primera de ellas es precisamente la primera que se hizo al inglés de la obra de Cervantes, cuyo autor es Thomas Shelton, en 1612. La segunda, algo más alejada del aspecto de la traducción, es obra de John Phillips, en 1687. Asimismo, comentaremos los aspectos más importantes de estas dos traducciones, tomando como referencia los ocho primeros capítulos de la primera parte del *Quijote*, así como el contexto en el que estas traducciones fueron escritas.

ABSTRACT

In this essay we will study two seventeenth-century English translations of *Don Quixote*. The first of them is precisely the first one ever made into English of Cervantes's work, whose author is Thomas Shelton. It was published in 1612. The second one, a bit far from the ideal of a literary translation, is the work of John Phillips, in 1687. I will comment the most important aspects of these two translations as well, taking as a reference the first eight chapters of the first part of *Don Quixote*, as well as the context in which they were produced.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Traducción, adaptación, aspectos.

KEY WORDS: Translation, adaptation, aspects.

INDEX

1. Introduction
2. Methodology
3. State of the Art
 - 3.1 Don Quixote and its critical reception in seventeenth Century England.
 - 3.2 List and Introduction of Don Quixote's English translations in the seventeenth century.
 - 3.3 Thomas Shelton and John Phillips: a biographical and literary note.
4. Progress
 - 4.1 Commentary and analysis on Shelton's translation.
 - 4.2 Commentary and analysis on Phillips' translation.
5. Conclusion.
6. Bibliography.

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation has always been a great topic to discuss. Due to the variety of techniques literary translators use, their own approaches and even their social circumstances, the translation of a book can differ from one translator to another. Therefore, it is important to account how an original book can be changed in some way when translated, and how these translations can be so different from one another.

In this essay, we will analyse one universal book, *Don Quixote* (1605, 1615), written by Miguel de Cervantes, and two of its translations into the English language (Thomas Shelton, 1612, and John Phillips, 1687), comparing them and observing that, indeed, one translation is completely different from the other. Besides, we will also explain the translators' techniques, as well as the literary, social and cultural circumstances around these two translations.

The reason why this topic was chosen was mainly to study the idiosyncrasies of two completely different English translations from *Don Quixote*. Becoming more familiar with translation was another reason, as it is one of the most important aspects when studying languages. And then, the simple curiosity of how a masterpiece such as *Don Quixote*, with all nuances and depth, could be translated. In the very beginning, soon after its publication (Thomas Shelton) with almost no sources to support onto, and afterwards, almost at the end of the century, in 1687, with the progress in the knowledge of the original that it implies.

So, by analysing both Thomas Shelton and John Phillips, the aim of this essay is to show how a translation can vary depending on the period and the person who translates.

2. METHODOLOGY

Concerning the methodology and the sources, this essay could be divided in two parts. The first one was more a job of collection of information about Thomas Shelton and John Phillips, looking for facts of their times, and even more important, their approaches, so different from each other. They could be influenced by other authors or even had to write the translation in a short period of time. These aspects are of vital importance if we want to know them (and their translations, as well) better. So primary sources (articles and books) helped here in order to find information about these two translators, as for example, “Tobias Smollett and the Translators of the Quixote” by Julie Candler Hayes or “John Phillips, John Milton, Don Quixote, and the Disenchantment of Romance”, by Anna K. Nardo. However, the source which provided the most information in this part was *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*, edited by John A. G. Ardila, particularly chapters one, “The Influence and Reception of Cervantes in Britain, 1607-2005” (written by J.A.G. Ardila), chapter two “The Critical Reception of Don Quixote in England, 1605-1900” (by Frans de Bruyn) and chapter three “The English Translations of Cervantes’s Works across the Centuries” (written by both Arantza Mayo and J.A.G. Ardila). This source was very useful due to the fact that it talks about both Shelton and Phillips, showing us their social circumstances and providing more information about their influences and approaches. Besides, it also provides useful information about how *Don Quixote* was received in England at that time.

For the second part, having finished looking for this important background information, the sources we used were a critical edition of the original text of *Don Quixote*, edited by Francisco Rico, as well as both translations into English, Shelton (*The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*) and Phillips’ (*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*) ones. As a matter of fact, we have used the first original editions of these translations. As the entire work by Cervantes was beyond the aim and scope of the present study, I have chosen the first eight chapters of the first part of Don Quixote for reasons that will be explained below. As a matter of analysis of the texts, we have

compared the three texts (the original and the two English versions) and looked for curiosities and aspects worthy of commentary.

3. STATE OF THE ART.

3.1 DON QUIXOTE AND ITS CRITICAL RECEPTION IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND.

As we are going to talk about *Don Quixote*, which could be considered as the summit of the Spanish literature and needs almost no presentation, we will go into detail about what is more important in this essay. So, we can measure the importance of such a masterpiece by its translations into other languages. We are talking, after all, about one of the most translated books together with the Bible. In this essay we will focus on two seventeenth-century English translations. The first one that was made of *Don Quixote* into this language, Thomas Shelton's, was probably written in 1607 (just two years after the publication of the first part of *El Quijote* in Spain), but published in 1612. The second is by John Phillips, made in 1687, and including the two parts. But before going deeper into these translations, we should talk about the influence in general of Cervantes and *Don Quixote* in England, in order to have a better understanding of its importance and development through the years.

First of all, we should say that more than a century before Defoe, Richardson, Fielding and Smollet, some Spanish writers already produced several works which were considered novels, such as *Lazarillo de Tormes* and *Don Quixote*. Although not widespread, works of prose fiction were not uncommon during the Elizabethan period in England. The best known by then was Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* (published posthumously in 1590) but it was not until the end of the seventeenth century when there was someone who started writing prose fiction professionally. This writer was Aphra Behn, with *Oronooko* (1688). So, when in the eighteenth century the novel started to rise in England, becoming little by little the dominant genre, English writers were already aware of a corpus of Spanish novels (which, in addition, were translated into English in the seventeenth century). These, besides, were written in the so-called *Golden Age* of the Spanish literature, the period in which the development of its

literature was obvious and patent.¹ So these Spanish picaresque novels were influential not only upon authors unknown today, but also upon literary masters of seventeen and eighteenth centuries as John Bunyan (in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, which we will briefly commented afterwards), Tobias Smollett and even Defoe, who wrote some of his novels, such as *Moll Flanders* (1722), *Captain Jack* (1722) and *Roxana* (1724) under the influence of these Spanish picaresque novels, emulating its contents and form. The influence that Spanish novels exerted on the development of the novel in England is clear then.

The influence of *Don Quixote* in England can be seen in the allusions to characters and passages of many works in seventeenth-century English literature. Those who have researched Cervantes's works in Britain agree that *Don Quixote* is a very influential book, as it is a perfect literary source for emulations and adaptations, a subject for literary criticism and also as a lexical source. The first mention of a motif from this work in English literature comes from a play by George Wilkins, *The Miseries of Inforst Marriage* (1607), probably the first mention in which an allusion to the book is clearly made when a character, William Scarborough claims: 'now I am armed to fight with a windmill', alluding to the famous chapter in which Don Quixote fight against windmills thinking that they are giants. We find other examples of these emulations in Thomas Middleton's *Your Five Gallants* (1607), Ben Jonson's *The Epicoene* (1610) and *The Alchemist* (1611), Michael Drayton's *Nymphidia* (1627) just to name some of them, although there are numerous works which make allusions to Cervantes's work.² However, this taste for the Spanish literature did not start with *Don Quixote*, because before its publication, many Spanish books were translated into English, with a wide range of titles and authors. In fact, Spanish books were usually translated into English soon after their publication, so we can also see in this aspect the importance Britain gave to Spanish literature at this time. Moreover, London playwrights soon began to borrow Cervantine plots and even Sancho started to become extremely popular. However, this interest of playwrights in Cervantes did not end in *Don Quixote*, but spread to other works by Cervantes such as the *Exemplary Novels* (written between

1 Ardila, J. A. G. "The Influence and Reception of Cervantes in Britain 1605-2005". Ardila, J.A.G. (Ed.). (2009) *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*. Great Britain, p. 2.

2 Ibid., p 3.

1590 and 1612, being published in 1613). The first translation into English was made in 1640, by James Mabbe, although it included only six of the twelve stories of the original book, which were “*The two Damsels*” (“*Las dos doncellas*”), “*The Ladie Cornelia*” (“*La señora Cornelia*”), “*The liberall Lover*” (“*El amante liberal*”), “*The force of Bloud*” (“*La fuerza de la sangre*”), “*The Spanish Ladie*” (“*La española inglesa*”) and “*The jaleous Husband*” (“*El celoso extremeño*”).³ Authors such as Fletcher, Middleton and Massinger found in the *Exemplary Novels* a wide source of plots. As a curiosity, so famous became *Don Quixote* that there was even a popular dance called the Sancho Panza.⁴

Besides, Cervantes did not write only *Don Quixote*, but many other books as *La Galatea* or *Novelas Ejemplares*, for instance. His last work, the novel *Persiles y Sigismunda*, was published posthumously in Spain in 1616 and translated into English in 1619 (a version that used the intermediation of a French translation made in 1617). However, as the most important and significant work, the history of English translations of Cervantes in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is based on *Don Quixote*. Obviously, this does not mean that other works by Cervantes were not translated, but instead, did not take the importance of the masterpiece of Cervantes. *Novelas Ejemplares*, nevertheless, had their importance, especially in the seventeenth century, having a great degree of popularity thanks to some playwrights’s adaptations such as Fletcher or Middleton’s. On one hand, Fletcher wrote *The Chances* (adapting *La Señora Cornelia*) and *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife* (*El Casamiento Engañoso*), on the other hand there is Middleton, who adapted *La fuerza de la sangre* and *La gitanilla* by writing *The Spanish Gypsy*.⁵

Most interesting, however, is the emulation of *Don Quixote* in John Bunyan’s novel *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, written in 1678. Its similarity with Cervantes’ work is clear in its plot. Here, we are presented with a man, Christian, who starts reading the Bible and becomes mad, setting on a journey in search of a heavenly city. The parallelism with *Don Quixote’s* plot is obvious, as the protagonist in Cervantes’ work

3 Ibid., p 5.

4 Ibid., pp. 4-6.

5 Mayo, Arantza and Ardila, J. A. G. "The English Translations of Cervantes's Works across the Centuries" Ardila, J.A.G. (Ed.). (2009) *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*. Great Britain, p. 54.

became also mad due to the fact of reading chivalric books, starting a journey which had the search for adventures its main aim. Other works such as Samuel Butler's *Hudibras* or Thomas D'Urfey's three-part play on *Don Quixote*, *The Comical History of Don Quixote*, also deserves a mention.

Talking about the critical reception of *Don Quixote*, we should say that the book had a curious development through the time. From the predominant satire, comical, burlesque performance in the seventeenth century to the novel it is nowadays, a masterpiece which concerns such mature topics as human life and feelings, for example. A reason for this could be the modes of reading and interpretation, which are always changing. For example, Renaissance readers have a different perception of the genre of romance from their eighteenth and nineteenth-century descendants. That is, modes of reading and interpretation differed from those of subsequent generations, tending in character to the emblematic, analogical and allegorical. Besides, there was not a critical tradition or analytical vocabulary to account for new vernacular forms of writing, especially prose fiction. Now, for example, twenty-first-century readers are more used to this form of writing than before due to the fact that the novel is considered as a pervasive and a dominant literary form supported, besides, by an extensive critical discourse.⁶

Some key points of this development of *Don Quixote* in Great Britain (and of the novel in general) are, on one hand, the favourable judgement of John Locke in *Some Thoughts Concerning Reading and Study for a Gentleman* (which is an appendix to *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, written in 1703) in which he presents an idea of entertainment and delight as legitimate uses of reading. On the other hand, William Vaughan's thought of the possible and, in fact, perfect combination of light and serious matters in Spanish novels in his treatise *The Golden Fleece* is also important for the rise of the novel. In this work, Vaughan explains to us how comedy, laughter and parody can be well used for serious moral purposes. Meanwhile, other works were written, such as Samuel Butler's *Hudibras* (divided into three parts, written in 1663, 1664 and 1678, respectively), which could be considered as a critical vindication of *Don Quixote* as a high burlesque performance. This publication is also an important point in the

⁶ De Bruyn, Frans "The Critical Reception of Don Quixote in England 1605-1900". Ardila, J.A.G. (Ed.). (2009) *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*. Great Britain, pp. 32-33.

development of Cervantes's work in Great Britain.⁷ So, the decision of many authors of imitating a previous one is the perfect reason to convince of the importance of the work which is being imitated, as it happens with *Don Quixote*. A work is made a classic by its translations, imitations and reinterpretations.

3.2 LIST AND INTRODUCTION OF DON QUIXOTE'S ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

In this essay, we will focus on two among the several translations of *Don Quixote* that were made in the seventeenth century. Firstly, we will enumerate every translation made in the seventeenth century, and then a closer look will be given at those by Shelton and Phillips. We could say that the seventeenth century, regarding *Don Quixote* translations, has two key moments. The first one is, obviously, the first translation of the first part (Thomas Shelton's one), due to the fact that after this one, some ensuing translations are mere corrections of Shelton's work. At least until we arrive to 1687, the second key point in the history of seventeenth-century translations of Cervantes, and the year in which John Phillips made his own translation of Cervantes' *Don Quixote*. Phillips marks a clear departure from Shelton, and the reasons for these changes are worth noting.

The English seventeenth-century translations of *Don Quixote* are the following:⁸

1. *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London. Printed by William Stansby, for Ed. Blount and W. Barret. (1612). Written by Thomas Shelton.
2. *The First Part of the History of the valorous and witty Knight-Errant Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London. Printed for Ed. Blount. (1620). Written by Thomas Shelton.

⁷ Ibid., pp 34-36.

⁸ Santana Sanjurjo, Victoriano (1998). "Breve aproximación a las traducciones inglesas del Quijote en el siglo XVII". V. Santana (Ed.) *Cervantófila Teldesiana*. Madrid. M.I. Ayuntamiento de Telde.

3. *The Second Part of the History of the Valorous and Witty Knight-Errant Don Quixote of the Mancha.* London. Printed for Ed. Blount. (1622). Written by Thomas Shelton.
4. Book one, First Part. *The History of the valorous and Witty-Knight Errant Don Quixote of the Mancha.* London. Printed by Richard Hodgkinsonne. (1652).
5. Book two, Second Part. *The second part of the History of the valorous and Witty Knight-Errant Don Quixote of the Mancha.* London. Printed by Richard Hodgkinsonne. (1652).
6. *The second part of the History of the Valorous and Witty-Knight Errant Don Quixote of the Mancha.* Printed by Richard Hodgkinsonne. (1672).
7. *The History of the Valorous and Witty Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha.* London. Printed by R. Scot, T. Basset, J. Wright, R. Chiswell. (1675).
8. *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.* London. Printed by Tho. Hodgkin. (1687). Written by John Phillips.
9. *The Delightful History of Don Quixot, The most renowned Baron of Mancha Containing his Noble Atchievements, and Surprizing Adventures, his Daring Enterprises, and Valiant Engagements for the Peerless Dulcinea del Toboso, and the Various and wonderful Occurences that attended his Love and Arms. Also the Comical Humours of His Facetious Squire, Sancho Pancha, And all other Matters that conduce to the Illustration of that celebrated History, no less pleasant than gravely Moral.* London. Anonymous. (1689).
10. *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.* London. Printed by Sam Buckley (1700). Written by Peter Anthony Motteux.

So, after looking at these translations we can observe how the two key points mentioned before are clear just looking at the titles. Whereas until 1687 the titles are all the same, imitating the first translation made into English by Thomas Shelton, John Phillips departs from the tendency of correcting Shelton's work, writing a completely

new one (this is patent even in the title of his edition). So we can say that these translations, are mere reissues from Shelton's translation, except from the one by John Phillips and the one by Motteux, who wrote his more closely to other seventeenth-century translators, readers and Cervantes scholars such as Gayton, D'Urfey and Phillips (his work is most closely related to that of Phillips, especially at a grammatical level).

After this brief introduction, what is really important in this essay is that along this century we have ten translations, starting with Thomas Shelton's in 1612, which we will discuss later. After this one, we find the first correction in 1620, although there are some doubts about the year of its publication. The importance of this translation, believed to belong to Shelton, resides in being a very well corrected work of the previous one. Besides its quality is patent, as it is taken as a model for the next translations, which we are going to see now. The following one is written in 1652, and we are in front of a new corrected translation of Shelton's work, this one made by Richard Hodgkinsonne. This is the first edition in which both parts of *Don Quixote* appear together. Moving on, we find another translation in 1672, printed again by Hodgkinsonne. This edition is just the reprint of the second part of *Don Quixote's* 1652 translation, which makes us think that during 1672 it was possible that there were some copies of the first part of 1652. So, in order to sell the whole work, second parts were printed and afterwards, used to gather it with the first part of 1675, which is the next translation we are going to see. Made by Scot, Basset, Wright and Chiswell, this work is a reprint of Shelton's translation of the first part, binding it together with Hodgkinsonne's second part of 1672.

Now we get to a completely new translation, in 1687, done by John Phillips. This one is well known due to its changes in relation to the original *Don Quixote*. In fact, due to its numerous alterations, this edition has never been reprinted. So the importance of Phillips' work resides in giving us a version of *Don Quixote* which has little to do with the letter of the original work, being an edition that reflects the generalized opinion (the one of a comical and burlesque story) of the book that exists in England in that period more than a mere translation. Finally, the last translation made in the seventeenth century, in 1689, which is done by E.S., the initials of the supposed translator. We have here, then, the earliest anonymous version of *Don Quixote* in

Britain, actually an abridgement, shortening the original novel (19 chapters for the first part and 31 for the second).⁹

3.3 THOMAS SHELTON AND JOHN PHILLIPS: A BIOGRAPHICAL AND LITERARY NOTE.

So, going deeper into the key matter of this essay, we will analyse Shelton and Phillips' works. The reason why these two translations were chosen are clear. Concerning Shelton's, it was the first one ever done into the English language, so its importance comes out of this, apart from being contemporary to Cervantes and the use of a literal approach to translation. On the other hand, we have Phillips' work, which is more an adaptation of *Don Quixote* to the English culture of the moment than a translation. The peculiarity of his way of translating such a masterpiece as *Don Quixote* has been a matter of discussion and analysis, and so it is in this essay.

We will now introduce Shelton and his first version of 1612. Thomas Shelton (fl. 1604-1620) was born in Ireland into a Catholic family. Shelton was the son of a trader that died, after nine years of confinement in Dublin's castle, due to his loyalty to the Catholic faith. He was a participant in a Catholic complot whose aim was the capture of Dublin's castle for the Irish rebel Hugh O'Neill. Thomas Shelton suffered persecution after his involvement in this assault, having to leave Ireland in order to survive. This Catholic faith was inherited, and it became ingrained in Shelton. Such was allusion to God when he thinks that his mention could be hilarious. As an example, the invocation "Dios poderoso" in the Spanish version is changed into Shelton's work by "Almighty Jove" (today known as Jupiter, the roman god).¹⁰ Moving now onto his work, as the first English translation of *Don Quixote*, Shelton had no references at all. However, he took as a base for his edition the one of Roger Velpius, from Brussels, published in 1607; so

9 Santana Sanjurjo, Victoriano (1998). "Breve aproximación a las traducciones inglesas del Quijote en el siglo XVII". V. Santana (Ed.) *Cervantófila Teldesiana*. Madrid. M.I. Ayuntamiento de Telde.

10 Cunchillos Jaime, Carmelo. "La Primera traducción inglesa del Quijote de Thomas Shelton (1612-1620)". *Cuadernos de Investigación Filológica*, (1983) p. 66-83.

as he took this work as a starting point to write his, there are numerous similitudes between them.¹¹ Besides, these similarities were also proved by James Fitzmaurice-Kelly in his *The History of Don Quixote of the Mancha: Translated from the Spanish of Miguel de Cervantes by Thomas Shelton: Annis 1612, 1620* written in 1896, confirming that the numbers which appear next to certain Spanish terms within the margins of his translation refers to the pages in which these expressions appear in the Brussels edition. Even in the English version appears the correction introduced in the Brussels edition, concerning the famous chapter twenty-three, in which Sancho Panza's donkey is stolen.¹² Shelton's excessive literality also contributed to determining the source he used, because after analysing some works he could base his translation on, the only one that was similar was Brussels' 1607 edition. This patent literality was maybe due to the fact he had to finish the translation in the short period of time of forty days. So this makes us think that hurry made him to be satisfied with the first word which would fit, losing many curious aspects and nuances which the original had and changing the meaning in some cases. Besides, being a contemporary of Cervantes did not help him much: the lack of familiarity of that period with the Spanish language took its toll on, although he is believed to have resided in the Irish residence at the University of Salamanca and later, at some time exiled, in the Spanish Flanders. Anyway, in his 1620 revision he cleaned up many of these words, improving his previous work (we have to remember that this edition will be the model for following translations). So, the initial influence that Shelton's work applied to the image of *Don Quixote* was the one of a farcical knight-errant. However, despite all of these hints in Shelton's translation, Sandra Gerhard (his most fervent defender) argues that he “also distinguishes clearly between a high and low register, unlike the many subsequent versions that reflect a horror of violating decorum or otherwise undermining that the work has been accorded within high culture” and points to “the effective preservation of the rhythm and energy of the Cervantine text in the retention of features such as pronounced antithesis, enumerations and accumulations, and forceful sentence openings”.¹³

11 Santana Sanjurjo, Victoriano (1998). "Breve aproximación a las traducciones inglesas del Quijote en el siglo XVII". V. Santana (Ed.) *Cervantófila Teldesiana*. Madrid. M.I. Ayuntamiento de Telde.

12 Cunchillos Jaime, Carmelo. "La Primera traducción inglesa del Quijote de Thomas Shelton (1612-1620)". *Cuadernos de Investigación Filológica*, (1983) p. 77.

Besides, not only aspects concerning just the translation did not help for the first image that English had from *Don Quixote*. The socio-cultural moment of Britain is also key to understanding why England had such a concept of the novel. This image that British readers developed was mainly the one of a burlesque protagonist. Due to the fact that British did not know well the romances centred around *Amadis de Gaula*, they could not understand the parody that Cervantes' made from it in order to write *Don Quixote*.¹⁴ In England the book was known only through its French translation (in fact, it was generally referred by its French title *Amadis de Gaule*). However, the most influential fact was the Puritan work ethic, which challenged and derided the image of the hidalgo class that was thought to represent. Social circumstances did not help either. There was some kind of anxiety due to the Spanish monarchy, which invade the British with the Armada and Catholic persecution of Protestants as the result of royal marriage.¹⁵

Nevertheless, although these aspects influence the first image of *Don Quixote*, it did not stop Shelton's work from being such an important translation. We are talking, after all, of the first one ever made of Cervantes' work to the British language and the one which will be taken as a base for future corrections and translations.

Moving on to John Phillips' edition, there are numerous aspects to discuss, being such a peculiar translation. On the one hand, after Shelton's translation, attention to *Don Quixote* in England started to rise amazingly. His translation is part of a tradition of works which were interested in the idea of Don Quixote. That is, a sudden interest that appeared upon some authors, who wanted to write about the history and character. The jocular tone in Phillips' work was due to the influence of the commentary that Edmund Gayton wrote on *Don Quixote*, *Pleasant notes upon Don Quixote* (1654). Gayton portrays Don Quixote and Sancho as a pair of buffoons at whom everyone jeers, so the tone Phillips used was probably based on this image of the two protagonists that Gayton exposed. What Phillips did then was to follow this movement of interest concerning *Don Quixote*, giving it continuation. Another example of this interest in Cervantes's

13 Colahan, Clark, "Shelton and the Farcical Perception of *Don Quixote* in Seventeenth-Century Britain". Ardila, J.A.G. (Ed.). (2009) *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*. Great Britain, p. 62.

14 Ibid., pp. 62-63.

15 Ibid., pp. 62-63.

work is Thomas D'Urfey, who wrote in the 1690s the first English musical comedy, which resulted to be a successful trilogy (*The Comical History of Don Quixote*). Other authors would later follow this tendency, like Henry Fielding, who wrote in 1728 the theatre play *Don Quixote in England*.¹⁶ Despite being Milton's nephew, who tried to protect and "morally chain" Phillips, he developed a satiric and bawdy way of writing. The most peculiar feature of John Phillips' translation is how he took the licence of not consulting the original copy of *Don Quixote*, taking instead Shelton's and Filleau de Saint-Martin's French one translations.¹⁷ He added and modified then the text, with a vulgar sense of humour. So, taking it as an adaptation, more than a translation, critics have never been kind respecting Phillips' work. Despite everything, as Hayes points out, 'his attraction, instead, was the collusion he made available to second- and third-time readers, the sense of intellectual superiority produced by being in on the joke. In addition, Phillips is a fascinating example of the tendency for travesty...'.¹⁸ Although it is not a very welcome translation, it has curious aspects that make Phillips' edition interesting and an object of study and analysis. It is also a perfect reflection of the late-seventeenth century predominant interpretation of *Don Quixote* as a comic, satiric work.

Going back to the beginning of the previous paragraph, it is really important to point out at the influence Edmund Gayton exerted on next translators. His work *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot* could mark the beginning of a clownish idealization of *Don Quixote*. In fact, as we mentioned before, he is the direct influence of John Phillips jocular tone. His work was condemned by many critics, and was taken as the perfect example of the seventeenth-century's superficial reception of *Don Quixote*. However, despite he was demoted due to his superfluous views, he is the responsible for the first critical analysis of *Don Quixote*, where he managed to visualize the ontological qualities of Cervantes's hero. So Gayton is responsible for witnessing to the comical perception of *Don Quixote* in the seventeenth century, but he also showed that there was an awareness of Cervantes's novel being something more than a farce.¹⁹

16 Ibid., p 61.

17 Ibid., p. 64.

18 Ibid., p.64.

19 Ardila, J. A. G. "The Influence and Reception of Cervantes in Britain 1605-2005". Ardila, J.A.G. (Ed.). (2009) *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*. Great Britain, pp. 7-8.

So, the way John Phillips writes his translation is well connected to Gayton's work then. The second one trivializes the original novel in his *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot*, being a comic response, treating it as if it was just a jest-book. This comical view persisted in the Restoration, influenced by Gayton's work, which opened a path for future comical writers or translators, as we see in John Phillips' work, who follows him in this comical and burlesque tone and incorporates elements from the distorted vision of the knight which crystallized through Gayton's influence.²⁰

After this brief introduction of Phillips, we shall discuss the reasons of his peculiar way of translating and their relevance. By taking a look (afterwards, in the analysis of his translation) at how he translates the famous beginning of *Don Quixote*, adding and changing references, writing therefore a completely new one, we can imagine how the rest of the work is going to be written, because this is not an isolated fact, but something that is repeated along this edition.

As we already mentioned before, Phillips had a clear penchant for amplification and low humor, as we clearly notice in these lines. So, we can think that the intention of this translation was to write some kind of parody for readers who were already familiar with Shelton's version or with the original *Don Quixote*. It is not the only comic translation, as Paul Scarron's publication of *Le Virgile travesty en vers burlesques* in France in 1648 and Charles Cotton's *Scarronides* in England in 1664 are also versions which offered their readers an enhanced self-esteem by making the reader to take part in the joke, in some way. Besides, in a short dialogue that stands in for a preface ("Something Instead of an Epistle to the Reader"), Phillips presents the literary world as a cruel and dangerous environment fueled by economic competition, so his way of writing could be well influenced by this fact, giving less importance to this "competition" by writing in a more comical tone.²¹

The origin of this style could perfectly be his own uncle John Milton, who, in 1651, wrote a defense of the English revolution addressed to the European

20 De Bruyn, Frans "The Critical Reception of Don Quixote in England 1605-1900". Ardila, J.A.G. (Ed.). (2009) *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*. Great Britain, p. 34.

21 Candler Hayes, Julie (2005) *Tobias Smollett and the Translators of the Quixote*. Huntington Library Quarterly, pp. 645-655.

intelligentsia, *Defensio pro populo Anglican*. One year after its publication, it suffered an attack from an anonymous author and Milton trusted John Phillips, who was at that moment twenty-one years old, with the reply to this attack. He wrote then *Joannis Philippi Angli responsio ad apologiam anonymi* in 1652 with linguistic jokes, expressing this way the importance they gave to such a nonentity attack. Being trusted by John Milton, such an important figure in English literature, who was his uncle (and teacher) as well, filled him with enormous pride. As a matter of fact, Milton would later use a similar style to Phillips' one in order to counteract his opponent in *Defensio secunda pro populo Anglicano*, written in 1654; valuing besides Phillips' "low style". So, supported by his own uncle, he found his wicked and mock style for writing, mining it from that moment on.²² He later wrote some mock almanacs, following this line of satirical writing and developing it until what we could consider his summit, his translation (or adaptation) of *Don Quixote*.

Even so, despite the consideration of his edition more as an adaptation than a translation, it is a fact that he also translated some works, without adapting them as he did with *Don Quixote*. The reason is Paul Scarron and his burlesque of classical poetry, who would later influence Phillips' translation of *Don Quixote*. 'To oppose the obsequious imitation of the classics that was *de rigueur* in French literary circles, Scarron transformed gods and heroes into members of the French bourgeoisie and sprinkled his witty language with anachronism and street slang'.²³ Knowing Phillips' taste for travesty, it was obvious that he was attracted by this author, who wrote in a similar style. So, he translated a few works from Paul Scarron, as *Typhon, ou la Gigantomachie* and *Aeneid, Le Virgil Travesti*, doing a very good job indeed. Besides, the Interregnum exiles brought from France the historical romances based on Madame de Scudéry and La Calprenède, joining Phillips this craze too, publishing in 1677 the translations of both Scudéry's *Almahide; or, the Captive Queen* and *La Calprenède's Pharamond*. Whereas Phillips translates these works, he did not do the same with *Don Quixote*, probably due to the fact that he wanted to imitate Scarron's travesty of classical epic, finding some kind of warrant in the fact that Cervantes parodies as well chivalric

22 K. Nardo, Anna (2014, June) "John Phillips, John Milton, Don Quixote, and the Disenchantment of Romance". *Mosaic: a journal for the interdisciplinary study of literature*, Volume 47, Number 2, pp. 171-172.

23 Ibid., p. 177.

romance in his original work. He even compares Don Quixote's madness, or what is the same, the fictional stories Don Quixote makes up in his mind, as if there was a world completely different from the real one, to religious faith. He based this on the difficulty of finding a logical explanation to these facts.

In conclusion, after discussing all his features and style, we could say that Phillips is a really special author, and a translator who is worthy of a deeper attention than has been given. Every curious aspect of his way of writing or translating makes him someone who deserves closer study.

4. PROGRESS.

4.1 COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS ON SHELTON'S TRANSLATION.

So, we have just had a look and discussed Shelton and Phillips' translation approaches as a starting point for the analysis of their works. It would be impossible to analyse the whole novel and the two translations in a paper of this scope. We will take then the first eight chapters of the book and their respective translations. There are some reasons why these chapters have been chosen. Firstly, because they mark the beginning of the story and adventures of Don Quixote, so it is more convenient in order to contextualize our examples and to locate references. Besides, these first eight chapters form a whole in themselves. *Don Quixote* is a book with constant reflections but we do not have to forget that it was initially thought as a parody of chivalric romances, and these chapters are the clear example of this fact, with continuous funny references to this world, giving us the perfect chance to concentrate just on chivalric romance parodies. We have to think that the beginning of a book always marks the initial intention of the author, although it develops through its pages onwards, as it happens with Cervantes' work. As a curiosity, Cervantes divided his first part of *Don Quixote* into four "books", which could be considered as well as "parts", big fragments of text divided into chapters. The first eight chapters we have chosen form the first "book".

After this brief introduction, we will get to the point of analyzing Shelton and Phillips' translations of these chapters.

Firstly, we will begin with Shelton. As we already mentioned before, his most important feature is his excessive literality, and we can appreciate it at the very beginning of the translation. This is the first example:

Una olla de algo más vaca que carnero, salpicón las más noches, duelos y quebrantos los sábados [...].²⁴

24 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 27.

His pot consisted daily of somewhat more Beefe than Mutton, a little minced meate every night, griefes and complaints the Saturdayes [...].²⁵

The detail in which we have to focus here is the literal translation Shelton made of ‘*duelos y quebrantos*’. In Spain (and the intention Cervantes had writing this) this is a typical dish of the region of La Mancha, and Shelton translated it literally, with no knowledge of this Spanish dish, which consists of a mixture of pork’s fat, scrambled eggs and spicy pork sausage. So, whereas in Cervantes’s work Don Quixote eats a typical dish on Saturdays, Shelton gives it a negative connotation, as if Don Quixote were complaining that day, which has nothing to do with the original meaning. Literal translation induces Shelton to error.

Difficulties for Shelton to translate certain typical Spanish words continue along the chapters. Moving on to chapter three, we find another change of meaning in a word. We are now in the part where Don Quixote treats two prostitutes as if they were ladies, due to his madness:

Ella respondió con mucha humildad que se llamaba la Tolosa, y que era hija de un remendón natural de Toledo [...].²⁶

The word *remendón* in Spanish means a man who fixes old dresses. If we take a look at what Shelton translated, we will find that due to the fact of having no knowledge of these very typical Spanish words, he completely changes the word and therefore, the meaning:

And she answered with great buxomnes that she was named Tolosa, and was a butchers daughter of Toledo [...].²⁷

From a man who fixes old dresses we move onto someone who handles and sells meat. We can see then, that the word Thomas Shelton uses in this context has nothing to do with the original meaning.

25 Shelton, Thomas (1612) *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London, p. 1.

26 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 47.

27 Shelton, Thomas (1612) *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London, p. 22.

Another word with a complex meaning, in chapter four, is “hato”, which gave difficulties to translate it not only to Shelton, but also to Phillips, as we will see now in this extract:

[...] y yo prometo de tener aquí delante más cuidado con el hato.²⁸

And I promise to have more care of your things from henceforth.²⁹

[...] Indeed Master, I will be more careful for the future.³⁰

In Spain, “hato” means a flock of sheep, but it seems that in the seventeenth century (and also today) this word was not common, so the problems to translate it were evident, as we can observe in Shelton and Phillips’ translations. Both of them do not dare risk with a translation which could not fit well, especially Thomas Shelton, as we know how literal he translates the original work.

There are more details concerning literality on Shelton’s translation. Here are a few other examples. In chapter four, almost at the end, we have got one:

Cayó Rocinante, y fue rodando su amo una buena pieza por el campo
[...].³¹

Rozinante fell in fine, and his Master reeled over a good piece of the field
[...].³²

28 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 49.

29 Shelton, Thomas (1612) *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London, p. 24.

30 Phillips, John (1687) *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*. London, p. 15.

31 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 54.

32 Shelton, Thomas (1612) *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London, p. 30.

“Rodar un buena pieza” has the meaning in Spanish of falling over a considerable distance; meaning that Shelton omits, since he translate the expression literally (reeled over a good piece).

In order to finish this analysis, we will show now two perfect examples of Shelton’s literality as his most curious aspect. We find the first one in the chapter of the burning of the books, the sixth:

[...] y es menester quitarles todo aquello del castillo de la Fama y otras impertinencias de más importancia, para lo cual se les da término ultramarino, y como se enmendaren, así se usará con ellos de misericordia o de justicia [...].³³

[...] and we must moreover take out of him all that of the Castell of Fame, and other impertinencies of more consequence. Therefore wee give them a *terminus Ultramarinus*, and as they shall be corrected, so will we use mercy or iustice towards them [...].³⁴

“Terminus ultramarinus” comes from the Latin and this term is used in Spanish to express a long period of time. Shelton’s literality is patent again, using here the Latin expression, which is similar in spanish (“término ultramarino”) although we do not know if he knew the Spanish connotation of this word.

The second example, and the one we will close this analysis about Shelton with, is in chapter eight, nearly at the end of it:

El segundo religioso, que vio del modo que trataban a su compañero, puso piernas al castillo de su buena mula, y comenzó a correr por aquella campaña, más ligero que el mismo viento.³⁵

33 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 65.

34 Shelton, Thomas (1612) *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London, p. 43.

35 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 80.

The second religious man seeing how ugly his companion was used, made no wordes, but giving the Spurs to that Castell his Mule, did flie away through the field, as swift as the winde it selfe. ³⁶

Although the term “poner piernas” is not easy to translate, Shelton used the word “*Spurs*” for “piernas” very well, indeed, capturing the original meaning. However, it does not happen the same with “castillo”, which in this context keeps a metaphorical meaning, which is “big”, referring to the mule. In this case, Shelton could have understood the metaphor, but he used the literal word anyways.

So, as a conclusion for Shelton, we have observed that his main approach is the literality he uses for his translation. Obviously, this means a loss of many nuances in the original work, but also could make it easier for English readers to follow the story. Translating *Don Quixote* in forty days is a very complicated task and Shelton did it brilliantly in spite of the time he had.

4.2 COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS ON PHILLIPS' TRANSLATION.

After analysing Shelton's translation and its idiosyncrasies, which are mainly due to its literality as we have just seen, we now move on to John Phillips' one. There are numerous details in this work, being such a special translator as he is. Although we could consider it, as we already mentioned before analysing his style and its origin, an adaptation to the English world more than a translation as it is, for example, the one we have just commented of Shelton.

Previously, we commented that we would have a look at the beginning of his translation to have an idea of how he changed the original text. We will present the original one first and then Phillips' translation; afterwards, the very same extract from Shelton, in order to compare them:

³⁶ Shelton, Thomas (1612) *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London, p. 58.

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.³⁷

In some part of Mancha, of which the Name is at present slipt out of my Memory, not many years ago, there liv'd a certain Country Squire, of the Race of King Arthur's Tilters, that formerly wander'd from Town to Town, Cas'd up in Rusty old Iron, with Lance in Rest, and a Knight-Templers Target; bestriding a forlorn Pegasus, as Lean as a Dover Post-Horse, and a confounded Founder'd Jade to boot.³⁸

Here, we have the very famous first sentence of *Don Quixote*, in which we can observe a reference to King Arthur, part of an English legend which has nothing to do with Spain and its literature. In the original text, of course, this reference does not appear. This is one of the reasons we consider Phillips' work an adaptation, due to the fact that he introduces English references (and even changes the Spanish ones for English).

However, this is not the only curiosity from this extract. There are other aspects concerning translation that are worth of a commentary. First of all, the translation of "hidalgo", which in Spanish means someone who belongs to the lowest class of the aristocracy. Phillips already starts his way of ridiculing Don Quixote at the very beginning, situating him as a servant. In fact, Sancho Panza is described as a Squire in *Don Quixote*, and he is supposed to serve Don Quixote, so Phillips' intention seems to place Don Quixote at the same level. Besides, he mentions Pegasus, a majestic winged horse from Greek mythology, which has nothing to do with Don Quixote's horse and the vision Phillips tries to give us, which is of a miserable one ("forlorn"). So Phillips' travesty approach is present in these lines and we can perceive it. He even writes about the knight-templars, a Christian military group which existed in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when referring to his shield. We can also observe how he

37 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 27.

38 Phillips, John (1687) *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*. London, p.1.

extends the text (one of his techniques, called amplification, which we will comment later) and adorns it.

Now, we will show Shelton's extract, which will confirm us how literal he translates, comparing it with Phillips' one:

There lived not long since in a certaine village of the Mancha, the name where of I purposely omit, a Yeoman of their calling that use to pile up in their hals olde Launces, Halbards, Morriions, and such other armours and weapons. He was besides master of an ancient Target, a leane Stallion, and a swift Grey-hound.³⁹

First of all, Shelton does not use the same word as Phillips to refer to Don Quixote, not giving him such a low level as Phillips does. Whereas Phillips uses the word "Squire", which refers to someone of noble birth who serves a knight, Shelton uses "Yeoman", who is someone who owns a land, but is ranked below the gentry. He also translates in a literal way Don Quixote's horse and dog, in contrast to Phillips. "Leane" (thin) for the horse and "Swift" (fast) for the dog, are words which gives us the perfect meaning of what Cervantes wanted to say.

Whereas Shelton gives us a literal translation, Phillips likes to adorn his text, extending and changing it as he pleases. We will see now a clear example of this, in chapter one, while Don Quixote puts the name to his horse:

[...] y así, después de muchos nombres que formó, borró, y quitó, añadió, deshizo y tornó a hacer en su memoria e imaginación, al fin le vino a llamar "Rocinante" [...].⁴⁰

And so at length, alter several Names, which with long Study and Meditation, came into mind, rejecting some, blotting out others, chopping and changing, dashing out, putting in, scratching his Pate, rubbing his

39 Shelton, Thomas (1612) *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London, p. 1.

40 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 32.

Forehead, twitching his Beard, at last he pitch'd upon the celebrated and altisonante Name of Rozinante.⁴¹

With a superficial look, we can observe the length of Phillips' text compared with the original one. This is called amplification, and it is one of Phillips' favourite techniques. While in Cervantes' work Don Quixote just thinks for a name for his horse, in this extract Phillips modifies the text in order to adorn it, describing us physical acts Don Quixote does while he thinks of a name (as 'twitching his beard') that does not appear in the original text. As a comparison, we will now show this part of the book translated by Thomas Shelton, more literal as we will see:

[...] and therefore after many other names which he framed, blotted out, rejected, added, undid, and turned again to frame in his memory and imagination, he finally concluded to name him Rozinante [...].⁴²

We find another example of these changes he made ahead in the same first chapter:

Tuvo muchas veces competencia con el cura del lugar -que era hombre docto, graduado en Cigüenza- sobre cuál había sido mejor caballero: Palmerín de Inglaterra o Amadís de Gaula [...].⁴³

For the Curate of the Parish and He could never meet over a Pot of Nappy Drink and a Game at Backgammon, but they were always at Daggers-drawing about who was the bravest Kill-Giant, Palmerin of England or Amadís de Gaul [...].⁴⁴

41 Phillips, John (1687) *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*. London, p. 4.

42 Shelton, Thomas (1612) *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. London, p. 6.

43 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 29.

44 Phillips, John (1687) *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*. London, p. 3.

In this extract we can see a reference to a game, Backgammon, that Cervantes never mentioned. As a curiosity, backgammon is the English name which was given to a game whose origin is still uncertain. Some say it was from Mesopotamia, others from the Ancient Egypt. Nevertheless, its name in Spain is "tablas reales", which shows once more how Phillips changes the Spanish reference for the English one, in this case by changing the name of the game into the one of his culture. "*Daggers-drawn*" is a curious aspect from this translation, for the term is used when two people (or even a group) are about to argue or fight. So in this extract Phillips tries to tell us that the only thing Don Quixote could do with the Curate was to argue about the bravest Knight-Errant. In the Spanish original version, we can see "*tuvo muchas veces competencia*", but it does not reach the level of drama that Phillips intends to give. He even changes the reference to the Curate, omitting the place he graduates and writing instead about his life style, as he defines the curate as someone with no free time because he does not play games or have drinks with friends.

However, an example which could clearly show us his amplification technique and his taste of adorning the text is in chapter eight, at the end of it, when Don Quixote faces another man in combat:

El decir esto, y el apretar la espada, y el cubrirse bien de su rodela, y el arremeter al vizcaíno, todo fue en un tiempo, llevando determinación de aventurarlo todo a la de un golpe solo.⁴⁵

After which short Ejaculation, grasping his sword, and shouldring his Target with a short-hand swiftnes, and with a Tempestuous forehead, menacing nothing but Thunder and Destruction, he darted himself, Dragon-like upon his Enemy, as if he had resolv'd to venture the fortune of the Combat all upon one blow.⁴⁶

Using references such as a fantastic creature as it is a dragon and expressions such as "menacing thunder and destruction", Phillips narrates this extract as if it was a

45 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 82.

46 Phillips, John (1687) *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*. London, p.

chivalric novel in which a knight was about to face a powerful enemy (another example of his travesty and burlesque approach). It is not the case of the original one, which without being a parody after all, maintains certain seriousness, without any trace of ornaments, as in Phillips' translation.

Phillips even changes the names of Spanish places that Cervantes wrote in his original book. Instead of that, he decides to translate them as English locations, maybe to make more easy to English people to read it, but changing completely the original references by altering the world within the book. We can see this at the beginning of chapter three, where Don Quixote is about to be named knight errant:

[...] andando por diversas partes del mundo, buscando sus aventuras, sin que hubiese dejado los Percheles de Málaga, Islas de Riarán, Compás de Sevilla, Azoguevo de Segovia, la Olivera de Valencia, Rondilla de Granada, Playa de Sanlúcar, Potro de Córdoba y las Ventillas de Toledo y otras diversas partes [...].⁴⁷

[...] travelling through all parts of the World, in search of bold Adventures; to which purpose he had Leith no corner unvisited of the King Bench Rules, the skulking holes of Alfatia, the academy of the Fleet, the Colledge of Newgate, the Purlieus of Turnboll, and Picket-Hatch; the Bordello's of St. Giles's, Banstead-Downs, Newmarket-Heath: The Pits of Play-Houses, the Retirements of Ordinaries, the Booths of Smithfield and Sturbridge [...].⁴⁸

As we can observe, there is no place for such locations as Sevilla, Málaga or Córdoba (all Spanish locations) in Phillips' translation, but instead a battery of English references which could possibly be the equivalents (or the most similar) to the Spanish ones mentioned in the original version. So, this is the most important feature why Phillips' work is considered an adaptation to the English world.

47 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 42.

48 Phillips, John (1687) *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*. London, p. 11.

Another example of this is in chapter three, the same extract we analysed before with Shelton, when Don Quixote talks to both prostitutes. In order not to repeat Shelton's extract, we shall remember that the translation of the name of a whore and the birthplace of her father is literal (Tolosa and Toledo), whereas Phillips change both, maybe to make it more easy to read for English people:

Ella respondió con mucha humildad que se llamaba la Tolosa, y que era hija de un remendón natural de Toledo [...].⁴⁹

To which she answer'd with all Humility, That her Name was Betty, the Daughter of a Cobbler in Southwark, that kept a Stall under a Chandler's Shop in Kent-street [...].⁵⁰

We have already mentioned that Shelton completely changed the word *remendón*. Here, Phillips also changes it ('Cobbler', which means a person who mends shoes) getting closer to the original meaning (a man who mends old dresses, as we already said before) than Shelton's translation for sure (which was, if we remember, the person who sells meat in a shop, the butcher).

In chapter eight, we have got another detail of the changing of Spanish locations:

[...] y de cuando en cuando empinaba la bota, con tanto gusto, que le pudiera envidiar el más regalado bodeguero de Málaga. ⁵¹

[...] ever and anon lifting his Bottle to his Nose, as would have made a *Dutch-man* a dry to have seen him. ⁵²

49 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, p. 47.

50 Phillips, John (1687) *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*. London, p. 14.

51 Rico, Fco (Ed.). (2004) De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid, pp. 77-78.

52 Phillips, John (1687) *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*. London, p. 31.

Málaga wines were deeply appreciated in Spain, and maybe Phillips changed here the reference for a dutch man because maybe, in Phillips' period, Dutch wines were very famous.

However, in chapter six, the one of the burning of the chivalric books, John Phillips respects their names, translating them, instead of adapting or making changes as we have seen before in some extracts. Being a chapter which involves Spanish books, maybe he would like to respect Spanish literature and did not change them as if the books were English. In order not to write more extracts, we will leave here some examples as "*Atchievements of Esplandian*" for "*Sergas de Esplandián*" (this one is, in fact, very well done, due to the fact that *Sergas* is not a common word even in Spanish and Phillips knew which the meaning was, translating it with the best possible word), "*Florismart of Hyrcania*" for "*Florismarte de Hircania*" or "*Mirroure of Knighthood*" instead of "*Espejo de caballerías*". Knowing Phillips as he is, this is a really curious feature, due to the fact that he translates as a modern translator, looking for the best words to fit in and not changing them as he pleased as he is used to.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, after analysing the three texts we could see how, for example, the matter of time influenced Shelton's translation. It has been demonstrated that it is not a good way of working if you are in a hurry, and having to finish the translation in forty days clearly produced havoc in his translation. However, this could also allow us to see how special is his work, and how a determined circumstance changes the way of writing, or translating. He later wrote a correction of his own work, which gives us an idea that if he had time when translating *Don Quixote* for the first time, maybe his translation would not be as literal as it is. Critics agree at pointing at Shelton's mistakes as a fact of the hurry, abusing of careless choices of copied vocabulary from Spanish and free adaptation when translation was difficult.

On the other hand, we have Phillips, who, as we have just seen, is an author we could talk of for a long time, due to his endless translation aspects, which are very interesting. Amplification, ornaments, English references, all these aspects and much more makes this translation a one with lots of hints which are worth of a closer study. As he took Gayton as a reference for his approach, we may also thank him, because he is the origin of Phillips' way of translating *Don Quixote*. All numerous aspects concerning his tone comes from Gayton's work *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot*, which influenced seventeenth-century translators, as it did with Phillips. Although his work could be considered, as we already said many times in this essay, an adaptation more than a translation, it is this precisely which makes Phillips' translation so special.

So, as a matter of analysis, not everything about these two translations have been told, of course, but an approximate view of what could bring us and what we can expect with a closer study on these two works and when we face any translation in any language.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ardila, J.A.G., ed., *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain* (London: Modern Humanities Research Association and Maney Publishing, 2009).
- , ‘The Influence and Reception of Cervantes in Britain 1605-2005’, in *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*, ed by J. A. G. Ardila, pp. 2-31
- , ‘The Critical Reception of Don Quixote in England 1605-1900’, in Ardila, *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*, ed by Frans de Bruyn, 32-53
- , ‘The English Translations of Cervantes's Works across the Centuries’, in *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*, ed by Arantza Mayo and J. A. G. Ardila, pp. 54-60.
- , ‘Shelton and the Farcical Perception of *Don Quixote* in Seventeenth-Century Britain’, in *The Cervantean Heritage. Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain*, ed by Clark Colahan, pp. 61-65.
- Candler Hayes, Julie, ‘Tobias Smollett and the translators of the *Quixote*’, in *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote: Translated from the Spanish of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra by Tobias Smollett*, ed. by Martin C. Battestin and O. M. Brack Jr, 67 (2004), pp. 651-668.
- Cunchillos Jaime, Carmelo, ‘La Primera traducción inglesa del Quijote de Thomas Shelton (1612-1620)’ in *Cuadernos de Investigación Filológica*, (1983), pp. 63-88.
- Gayton, Edmund, *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot* (London, 1654).

- K. Nardo, Anna, 'John Phillips, John Milton, Don Quixote, and the Disenchantment of Romance', in *Mosaic: a journal for the interdisciplinary study of literature*, 47 (2014), 169-186.
- Fitzmaurice-Kelly, James, *The History of Don Quixote of the Mancha: Translated from the Spanish of Miguel de Cervantes by Thomas Shelton: Annis 1612, 1620* (London, 1896).
- Phillips, John, *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* (London, 1687).
- De Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel, *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, ed. by Francisco Rico (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 2004).
- Santana Sanjurjo, Victoriano, 'Breve aproximación a las traducciones inglesas del Quijote en el siglo XVII', in *Cervantófila Teldesiana*, ed. by V. Santana (Madrid: M.I. Ayuntamiento de Telde, 1998), pp. 87-106.
- Shelton, Thomas, *The History of the valorous and wittie Knight-Errant, Don Quixote of the Mancha*. (London, 1612).