Hermina Cielas Leão ⬤
Jagiellonian University, Poland | hermina.cielas@uj.edu.pl

David Pierdominici Leão ⬤
Jagiellonian University, Poland | david.pierdominici.leao@uj.edu.pl

From La Mancha to Kashmir:
Notes on the Windmill Episode in the Sanskrit Version
of *Don Quijote*

Abstract The present article aims at investigating selected passages from the Sanskrit version of Cervantes's *Don Quijote*. Published in 2019 as *Ḍān Kvikṣoṭaḥ*, the translation was completed in 1936 by two Kashmiri Pandits—Jagaddhar Zadoo and Nityanand Shastri—on the basis of an English rendering by Charles Jarvis published in 1742. The study of the windmill episode from the *Quijote* (I, 8) and the comparative analysis of the early modern Spanish original, the English medium, and the Sanskrit translation reveal how the practice of translating not from the original source may influence the meaning and enlighten the difficulties of rendering extraneous elements in a language such as Sanskrit, quite distant from morphological and phonetical points of view. In the course of the analysis special attention is paid to the rendering of proper names, modern concepts and objects, specific expressions and to the translation strategies employed by the Indian Pandits.

Keywords *Don Quijote*, *Ḍān Kvikṣoṭaḥ*, Cervantes, Sanskrit translation, Kashmiri Pandits, Modern Sanskrit Literature

1 Introduction

In 2006, Vibha Maurya, a former Professor of Spanish at the University of Delhi, published her translation of the first part of Cervantes's immortal novel, *Don Quijote* into Hindi; the task was completed with the addition of the second part in 2015, nearly 400 hundred years after the publication of the original work.[1] Maurya's effort is especially notable for one main reason: this Hindi translation represents the first complete Indian rendering of Cervantes's novel based on the early modern Spanish original text, without the medium of a translation in another language. This fact may seem surprising especially in the light of the long attested history of foreign translations of *Don Quijote*, starting basically after the printing of the first part in 1605.[2]

---

[1] See Maurya (2006; 2015).

[2] For more on the complex matter of *Don Quijote*'s translations in European and Indian languages, please refer to Dimitrov (2019: XI–XLI).

Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra (1547–1616), the foremost exponent of the late Spanish Renaissance and of the so called *siglo de oro*, 'the Golden Age', is acknowledged to be one of the greatest giants in world literature.[3] Despite a prolific activity as a writer, in the frame of a rather turbulent life, his fame is especially bound to a single work: *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*, that seems to embody the apogee of his thought and literary achievement. The first part of the novel was published in 1605 in Madrid, followed by the second one titled *Segunda parte del ingenioso caballero don Quijote de la Mancha* in 1615. The novel became quickly recognised and popular, as it is clear from the very early translations into English (1612–1620), French (1614–1618) and Italian (1622–1625), followed by a partial German rendering in 1648 (Dimitrov 2019: XII–XIII).

The enormous success and popularity of Cervantes's novel and the great number of circulating translations made in the 17th–18th centuries gave rise to a new bibliographical fashion. The bibliophiles from around the world started to collect copies of editions and translations for their private libraries. Some of them went even to the extreme of commissioning new renderings to enrich their collections.

From an Indological point of view, one of the most interesting cases is the one of the magnate Carl Tilden Keller (1872–1955), a Harvard-trained accountant in Boston whose fairly established social position allowed him to devote his resources to book collecting.[4] Keller's obsession with *Don Quijote* is attested by the fact that, by August 1936, his personal collection amounted to 500 editions, while only four years later it reached more than 700 exemplars. His efforts were mainly directed at acquiring translations of Cervantes's masterpiece in all possible languages; to reach this goal, Keller frequently commissioned translations to be made by scholars and specialists. One of the intermediaries recursed to by the American collector was Sir Marc Aurel Stein (1862–1943), a British archaeologist, explorer and philologist of Hungarian origin trained at Oxford. After a first meeting in London in 1924, and a closer acquaintance during Stein's sojourn at Harvard in 1929–1930, the two gentlemen initiated a collaboration with mutual gain: Keller secured financial resources for Stein's travels and expeditions in exchange for helping him to obtain new editions and translations of *Don Quijote*. Taking advantage of Stein's Sanskrit education and connections in India, the magnate inquired about the possibility of obtaining translations of Cervantes's novel into Indian languages and commissioning new ones. By the 1930s, the presence of Indian translations of the *Quijote* was already attested, the first being a Gujarati version published in monthly issues in 1885 and in book format in 1886–1888. However, these renderings were not conducted from the original early modern Spanish text, but through the medium of an English translation or another

---

[3] The account of Cervantes's biography is beyond the scope of the present article. An interested reader may refer to one of many works devoted to the topic, for instance Byron (1978) and McCrory (2002). For an overview of the life and writings of Cervantes, see Cascardi (2002).

[4] The following description of Keller's relation with Stein and the circumstances of commissioning the Sanskrit rendering of *Don Quijote* is based on Dimitrov (2019: XLIX–LXXIII).

Indian translation made from English one, often in an abridged version. As already noted, this state of matters prevailed until the early 21st century.

As evident from the extent of Keller's and Stein's correspondence, the bibliophile sought to obtain new translations of Cervantes's novel into different Asian languages, such as Tibetan, Manchu and Mongolian; similar efforts were of course directed towards the languages of India. The earliest reference to a possible commission to translate *Don Quijote* into Sanskrit and Kashmiri seems to appear in a letter dated to April 6, 1935. After considering possible options for this task, Aurel Stein decided to contact one of his old associates, Pandit Nityanand Shastri (1874–1942).[5] The Pandit agreed to undertake the project but, eventually, due to a paralysis resulting from an ischemic attack, sought for the assistance of Jagaddhar Zadoo (1890–1981). The scholars agreed to prepare partial translations of *Don Quijote* into Sanskrit and Kashmiri according to the wish of Keller, who provided them with a copy of an English translation and the chapters to be rendered marked by Stein.[6]

Although the correspondence between the parties involved in the endeavour does not specify a copy of which English translation was provided to the Pandits, Dragomir Dimitrov and other Marburg Indologists who prepared the critical edition of the text and published it in 2019 established that the Sanskrit rendering must have been based on the translation by Charles Jervas (c. 1675–1739) (Dimitrov 2019: XCV). Better known as Charles Jarvis due to a printing mistake, the translator was an Irish painter, art collector, and self-taught Hispanist, whose rendering of the *Quijote* was published posthumously in 1742 and gained popularity throughout the 18th–19th centuries.[7] Nityanand Shastri and Jagaddhar Zadoo completed the Sanskrit translation in August 1936 and the calligraphic copy of it reached Boston in April 1937. The manuscript adorned Keller's collection and, after his death in 1955, it was transferred to the Harvard library, where it was rediscovered in 2011 by Stanislav Jager from Marburg.

After this brief introduction that brings closer the circumstances of commissioning and publishing the only Sanskrit rendering of *Don Quijote*, our attention will focus on the text of translation and its relation to the Cervantes's original and the Jarvis's English version provided to Nityanand Shastri and Jagaddhar Zadoo by Keller and Stein.

2 The translations in comparison: proper names

The comparison between the early modern Spanish original, Jarvis's translation and the Sanskrit rendering reveal how the practice of translating not from the original source may influence the meaning and enlighten the difficulties of rendering extraneous elements in a language so distant from the Spanish.

---

[5] For more on the relation between Aurel Stein and the Kashmiri Pandits also see Pandita (2001).

[6] For more details concerning the Sanskrit and Kashmiri translations of selected parts of *Don Quijote* also consult Pandita (2002: 269–287).

[7] For more about Charles Jarvis and his translation of *Don Quijote*, please consult for example Pegum (2009).

First of all, interesting observations can be made analysing the Sanskrit rendering of the proper names of the main characters and of others, occasionally mentioned in the course of the narrative:[8]

Cervantes	Jarvis	Nityanand Shastri and Zadoo
Don Quijote	Don Quixote	*Ḍān Kvikṣoṭa*
Sancho Panza	Sancho Panza	*Sāṃcopāṃja*
Rocinante	Rosinante	*Rojinaṇṭa*
Dulcinea	Dulcinea	*Dolasenā*
Briareo	Briareus	*Brairasa*
Frestón	Friston	*Phriṣṭana*

The changes of the names proposed by Jarvis mirror to a smaller or larger extent the pronunciation of given names in Cervantes's original. The only exception is the name of the giant Briareus, rendered by Jarvis in its Latin form. An interesting case is the one of the names of Rocinante and Dulcinea: the form in which the former is rendered seems to suggest a phonetic adaptation of the original, while the latter is left unchanged, despite the occurrence of the very same phonetic sequence as in Rocinante, namely *ci*. Noteworthy is also the adaptation in the Sanskrit translation: of course, because of the significant differences of the Sanskrit phonetic system, the authors had to modify the names as in certain cases a direct phonetic rendition was not actually possible. Even though a more accurate rendering into Sanskrit from the original would not have been difficult or problematic, the Pandits' decision is understandable, considering that they did not have a direct access to the middle Spanish text.

Another matter is the meaning of the names: Cervantes named some of his characters with a precise intent that becomes lost in translation. For instance, the name Sancho Panza contains a clear comical reference to the character's appearance, as in Spanish *panza* colloquially denotes 'belly'. Dulcinea, don Quijote's beloved, took her name from the adjective *dulce*, meaning 'sweet', underlying her sweet character (at least in don Quijote's distorted vision of a common pig farmer). More complex is the genesis of the name Rocinante: in Spanish *rocín* refers to a 'work horse', while *ante* assumes different functions, as an adverbial suffix ('before') or as a marker

---

8 The proper names analysed in this part of the article were chosen to represent various translatological strategies adapted by the Pandits. An interested reader may find more examples of names of *Don Quijote*'s characters and their Sanskrit equivalents chosen by Nityanand Shastri and Zadoo in Dimitrov (2019: C–CI).

denoting 'in front of'. In this sense, the name of don Quijote's ride would mean 'the one that before was a working horse' / 'the horse in front of [all the others]' / 'the foremost of horses'. Following the example of other translators and not knowing the original Spanish meaning of the names, Shastri and Zadoo did not aim at rendering the names in Sanskrit despite the fact that the meaningful names often occur in Sanskrit literature and, in the case of *Don Quijote*, such strategy would help to keep the connotations intended by Cervantes. Nevertheless, the Pandits' choice to not adapt the proper names cannot be considered a flaw, even if, as we shall see, the Sanskrit translation of Dulcinea's name is idiosyncratic. Although it was possible, Shastri and Zadoo could not render it phonetically because of the hiatus that must be avoided in Sanskrit (the same was the case of Briareus) but their modification conveyed a meaningful result that can influence the perception of the character itself. *Dolasenā* represents a compound of two words: *dola*, 'swinging, shaking to and fro', and *senā*, 'spear, army', and can be translated as 'swinging spear / army'. Such a rendering is openly violating Cervantes's intent, purely comical, giving a sort of altisonant or heroic valence to a name that does not include such connotation. Similar adaptive choices are present elsewhere in the Pandits' translation, to mention only the case of Angelica, rendered into Sanskrit as *Añjalikā*, which means 'a little mouse', a term rarely occurring and attested only lexicographically. Lastly, the Pandits' choice concerning the rendering of the name of the wizard Frestón (*Phriṣṭana*), contains a *sandhi* imprecision, where the sibilant consonant has not been cerebralised at the contact with the following cerebral consonant (as in the phonetically correct way in which they rendered Rocinante as *Rojinaṇṭa*). Most probably, the cerebralisation of *t* resulted from the common practice of adapting as such every dental sound in English. However, in this case, more proper would have been to avoid cerebralisation whatsoever and, as a consequence, a *sandhi* irregularity. The phonetic rendering of the given names in Sanskrit contains one more inaccuracy: Sancho Panza and Rocinante are called *Sāṃcopāṃja* and *Rojinaṇṭa*, names in which a sibilant sound would have been more appropriate than the palatal *j*. However, most probably the choice of Shastri and Zadoo was dictated by the occurrence of *z* and *s* in the names in Jarvis's adaptation. Not knowing Spanish phonetics, the Pandits assumed that *z* and *s* are pronounced in the same way as in English and substituted them with *j* which in modern Indian languages can be pronounced as *z*, a sound that does not exist in Sanskrit.

3 The translations in comparison: renderings of the windmill episode

As we shall see, some problematic translatological issues can be observed on the example of one of the most famous episodes from Cervantes's novel: the windmill adventure that occurs in the first part of the novel, in its eighth chapter. Immediately after the meeting with Sancho Panza, when the farmer decides to serve don Quijote as his squire, the two characters encounter on their path some windmills. The knight mistakes them for giants and, despite Sancho's warnings, decides to attack.

The narrative segment of the windmill episode offers a relevant insight into strategies and dynamics of rendering Cervantes's text by Jarvis, as well as Nityanand Shastri and Zadoo. Apart from the proper names mentioned above, other particular aspects posed a challenge to the Pandits' work. Among them were the need of coining neologisms to denote extraneous concepts not present in Sanskrit, the struggle with conveying concepts so culturally distant from the Indian reality and maintaining the composition and style of the work.

For instance, a passage from an initial dialogue between don Quijote and his squire:

Cervantes[9]
[…] *porque ves allí, amigo Sancho Panza, donde se descubren treinta o pocos más **desaforados gigantes**, con quien pienso hacer batalla y quitarles a todos las vidas* […]. (Rico 2015: 103)

Jarvis[10]
[…] look yonder, friend Sancho Panza, where you may discover somewhat more than thirty **monstrous giants**, with whom I intend to fight, and take away all their lives […]. (Dimitrov 2019: 40)

Shastri and Zadoo
*itaḥ paśya, mitra sāṃcopāṃja! etān triṃśadadhikān **rākṣasān** | etān yuyutsur aham | eteṣāṃ prāṇān apahartum icchāmi |* (Dimitrov 2019: 41)

At a preliminary analysis it appears evident that the Pandits divided this passage into several shorter units, contrary to the original text and Jarvis's rendering. Moreover, Jarvis's translation of *desaforados gigantes* as *monstrous giants*—imprecise in itself—is responsible for a further imprecision in the Sanskrit adaptation. First of all, the adjective *desaforado* generally means 'unbridled, unrestrained', according to the definition given in the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* (*que obra sin ley ni fuero*—'who operates / behaves without laws nor jurisdiction'—, *fuero de lo común*—'out of ordinary') (DLC 1914: 339). Jarvis's adaptation of *desaforados* as 'monstrous' made the Pandits to choose a Sanskrit equivalent that would comprehend the idea of 'monstrous' and 'repulsive', namely *rākṣasa*, which according to the Sanskrit dictionaries denotes usually a 'demon', despite the fact that 'giant' could have been approximately conveyed as *mahāpuruṣa* for instance, and accompanied by an appropriate adjective (absent in the Sanskrit translation).

Similar issues are present also in the continuation of the same sentence, in which don Quijote explains to Sancho that his fight against the giants / mills is a *buena guerra*:

---

[9] All the quotations from the original early modern Spanish *Don Quijote* are based on the recent and most authoritative critical edition of Cervantes's work carried out under the aegis of Francisco Rico in 2015.

[10] All the quotations from Jarvis's translation published in 1907 in *The World's Classics* series edited by James Fritzmaurice-Kelly are given here after Dimitrov (2019).

Cervantes

[…] *que ésta es* **buena guerra**, *y es gran servicio de Dios quitar tan mala simiente de sobre la faz de la tierra* […]. (Rico 2015: 103)

Jarvis

[…] for it is **lawful war**, and doing God good service to take away so wicked a generation from off the face of the earth […]. (Dimitrov 2019: 40)

Shastri and Zadoo

dharmyo' yaṃ saṃgrāmaḥ | *yato bhūmitale' syā duṣṭasantatyāḥ samunmūlaneneśvarasyāpi mahān kāryabhāro laghūkṛto bhavet* | (Dimitrov 2019: 41)

Jarvis translated *buena guerra* as 'lawful war', even though the expression denotes 'fighting with noble spirit', an expression pertaining to the chivalry lexicon well attested in literature and so registered by the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* (DLC 1914: 526). The English translator's inaccuracy influenced the rendering proposed by Shastri and Zadoo as *dharmya saṃgrāma*, literally 'a fight according to the Dharma / righteous war',[11] suggesting a fight according to the universal principle, while in the Spanish original the conveyed idea denotes a guiding principle proper only for the code of a knight and his ethics.

A similar inaccuracy, not erroneous *per se* but obscuring the meaning intended by Cervantes, occurs in the translations of the following passage:

Cervantes

[…] *en el espacio que yo voy a entrar con ellos en* **fiera** *y desigual batalla* […]. (Rico 2015: 104)

Jarvis

[…] whilst I engage with them in a **fierce** and unequal combat […]. (Dimitrov 2019: 40)

Shastri and Zadoo

ebhiḥ saha **bhīṣaṇa***viṣamasaṃgrāmatatparasya mama* […] | (Dimitrov 2019: 41)

The Spanish adjective *fiero/-a* (Lat. *ferus/-a*, 'wild, untamed, uncivilised') denotes *bruto indómito, cruel y carnicero* ('a wild untamable person, cruel and bloodthirsty') (DLC 1914: 475); applying such connotation to the giants *desaforados*, Cervantes implied an idea of a 'wild clash' against 'untamed creatures'. Jarvis's choice apparently seems to lose such subtle connotation of meaning, grasping only a superficial

---

[11] The adjective *dharmya* comes from the noun *dharma* that denotes a manifold concept proper of several Indian philosophical and religious traditions. It is a term not easy to translate, as it signifies the same time 'virtue, morality, religious merit', 'customary observance or prescribed conduct', and 'Law or Justice personified' or 'that which is established or firm'. See Monier-Williams (2005: 510).

idea conveyed by the rather generic English adjective *fierce*. Relying on the English rendering, the Pandits furtherly accentuated the meaning advanced by Jarvis and, once again, charged it with horrifying connotations by using the term *bhīṣaṇa*, 'frightening, horrible, formidable'. Moreover, from the point of the intended sense, the employment of *bhīṣaṇa* could suggest that don Quijote is afraid to fight against his imaginary opponents; but, as we have observed in the previous passage, the knight is ready to welcome a *buena guerra*, to be fought according to his honour code.

Another passage testifies to how the Kashmiri Pandits were somehow misled by Jarvis's rendition, but, paradoxically, they fortuitously got closer to the Cervantes's original than the English translator:

> Cervantes
> […] *Non fuyades, **cobardes y viles criaturas**, que un solo caballero es el que os acomete* […]. (Rico 2015: 104)

> Jarvis
> […] Fly not, ye **cowards and evil caitiffs**; for it is a single knight who assaults you […]. (Dimitrov 2019: 42)

> Shastri and Zadoo
> […] ***kātarāḥ, nīcāḥ, duṣṭāḥ**, mā palāyata; aham ekākī vīro yuṣmān abhiyāsyan āgacchāmi* […] | (Dimitrov 2019: 43)

In the early modern Spanish original, Cervantes recurred to the specification *viles*: *vil* denotes a status or a person described as 'low, infamous', generally devoid of moral connotations; on the other hand, Jarvis translated the adjective as 'evil', placing it as a specification for 'caitiffs', an expression which was supposed to render *criaturas* (lit. 'creatures, beings'). At a closer analysis, it is clear that Jarvis's intention resulted in a pleonastic effect: according to the *Collins English Dictionary*, 'caitiff' denotes already by itself 'a cowardly or base person' (CED 1991: 226).[12] In order to render the passage in question Shastri and Zadoo resorted to the use of a string of adjectives: *kātarāḥ, nīcāḥ, duṣṭāḥ*, 'cowardly, low, evil'. It appears that while the first and third adjectives seem to be direct renditions from Jarvis's translation, the second, *nīca*, (much closer to Cervantes's *viles*) was presumably added due to its well-attested occurrence as an offensive expression in Sanskrit literature.[13]

Apart from the already presented translatological challenges encountered by the Pandits, one more, of different character, is worth mentioning, as it played an

---

[12] As noted by the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word 'caitiff' is attested in the Middle English Period, the earliest evidence dated to around 1325 (see OED). By the Jarvis's time, it was already obsolete and, according to the *Middle English Compendium*, denoted '(a) A miserable or unfortunate person, a wretch; a poor man, one of low birth; (b) a wicked man, scoundrel, one who is cowardly or covetous' (see MEC).

[13] *Nīca*, 'low, vile, inferior', as an offensive term or a negative attribute occurs in Sanskrit epic and classical *kāvya* literature. See Monier-Williams (2005: 565).

important role in the rendition of Cervantes's novel into Sanskrit. Due to the lack of specific expressions and words denoting particular extraneous objects and concepts, Shastri and Zadoo were forced to coin several neologisms and adapted preexisting Sanskrit words with new meanings. Some of them occur in the chapter describing the fights against the windmills:

Cervantes	Jarvis	Shastri and Zadoo
molino	windmill	[*vāyu(vi)cālita*]*peṣaṇīyantra*
aspa	sail	*vātapaṭa*
piedra del molino	millstone	*peṣaṇī*

The term *peṣaṇī* means in Sanskrit any kind of 'grind-stone', but in the translation of *Don Quijote* it serves to denote a specific stone, a millstone, and becomes a basis for the newly created compound [*vāyu(vi)cālita*]*peṣaṇīyantra* than can be literally translated as 'a grind-stone device [moved by the wind]'. Moreover, as noted by Dragomir Dimitrov, this neologism was adopted by the Pandits under the influence of *vāyupeṣaṇī* proposed for 'windmill' by Vaman Shivram Apte in his *Student's English-Sanskrit Dictionary* (Dimitrov 2019: XCVII). In fact, in the mentioned work, Apte gives two possible translations of the word 'windmill': *vāyucālyaṃ cakraṃ* and *vāyupeṣaṇī* (Apte 1893: 457). *Vātapaṭa*, a previously existing compound meaning 'wind-cloth, sail', without the specific context denotes a sail of the ship, as sail in the English language (Monier-Williams 2005: 934).[14]

    In the whole episode of the windmill fight, the most problematic sequence is the one describing the exact moment of don Quijote's attack. Due to the inherent difficulties of Cervantes's syntax, Jarvis's inaccuracies and the occurrence of vocabulary pertaining to the chivalry lexicon, the translation of Shastri and Zadoo inadvertently distorts the image and impedes the frenetic rhythm of the narration in Cervantes's original text:

> Cervantes
> […] *bien cubierto de su* **rodela***, con la* **lanza en el ristre***, arremetió a todo galope de Rocinante y embistió con el primero molino que estaba delante; y dándole una lanzada en el aspa, la volvió el viento con tanta furia, que hizo la lanza pedazos,* **llevándose tras sí al caballo y al caballero, que fue rodando muy maltrecho por el campo** […]. (Rico 2015: 104)

---

[14] The compound occurs already in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (for example in KSS XII, 34.174) a collection of Indian legends and folk tales by Somadeva (11th century). In this case, Apte's *Dictionary* was not helpful for the Pandits, because it does not register 'wind-cloth'. The author proposes some translations for the 'sail', but most of them are the compounds referring directly to the ship's sail, like for example *nauvasanaṃ-vastraṃ*, lit. 'ship cloth', as *nau* denotes 'a ship or a boat' and *vasana* and *vastra* both mean 'a cloth, garment'. See Apte (1893: 374).

Jarvis

[…] being well covered with his **buckler**, and setting his **lance in the rest**, he rushed on as fast as Rosinante could gallop, and attacked the first mill before him; and running his lance into the sail, the wind whirled it about with so much violence that it broke the lance to shivers, **dragging horse and rider after it**, **and tumbling them over and over on the plain, in very evil plight** […]. (Dimitrov 2019: 42)

Shastri and Zadoo

[…] ***kavacenā****tmānaṃ susaṃcchādya*, **kuntaṃ subaddhaṃ kṛtvā ca**, *rojinaṇṭadhāvanaśaktyanurūpayā tvarayā dhāvat tasya purato vartamānāṃ prathamāṃ peṣaṇīṃ samācakrāma | tasyā vātapaṭe kuntaṃ prāveśayat | prabalavāyuvegena paribhrāmitaṃ vāyupaṭaṃ tasya kuntaṃ khaṇḍaśo' karot | anyac ca, vāyupaṭākṛṣṭo'* **sau saturaṃgamo durgatiṃ prāpyānekavāraṃ bhūmitale papāta** | (Dimitrov 2019: 43)

Once again, Shastri and Zadoo, splitting the whole sentence from Jarvis's rendering, that mirrored the textual unity in Cervantes's original, simplified the complexity of this scene and significantly slowed down the rhythm of the action. Aside from structural considerations, the Pandits must have encountered several difficulties connected to specific terminology. In the first image, Cervantes portrayed don Quijote covering himself with his small shield and preparing for the attack by positioning the lance in the rest. However, the Sanskrit translation presents here two considerable problems: first of all, *rodela*, rendered correctly by Jarvis as 'buckler', was translated by Shastri and Zadoo as *kavaca*, a term denoting 'armour, coat of mail, any covering'. The technical expression from the chivalry lexicon, *lanza en el ristre*, '[setting his] lance in the rest', as conveyed by Jarvis, was amplified by the Pandits in a sequence held by a gerundial form from the stem *kṛ-*: *kuntaṃ subaddhaṃ kṛtvā ca*, 'and having rendered the lance well bound / clenched'. In the first case, it appears more than plausible that the choice of the Pandits to translate buckler as *kavaca* derived from a misunderstanding of the English word, which perfectly conveys the idea behind *rodela*, a term denoting a small round shield. The translation of the term could have been rendered correctly by recurring to the Sanskrit term *carman*, 'shield'—a noun well attested in the *itihāsa* literature, and suggested by the Apte's *The Student's English-Sanskrit Dictionary* used by the Pandits—perhaps accompanied by a further adjectival specification. The issue with 'lance in the rest' is more complex: it seems that the Pandits were not aware of the fact that the 'rest' denotes not a state but a specific part of the armour, namely a small metal hook attached to the side of the breast-plate serving to support the heavy weight of the weapon. The expression employed by Shastri and Zadoo suggests that don Quijote was firmly holding the lance and not positioning it for the attack. In consequence, the Sanskrit translation of the sentence in question significantly changes the scene drawn by Cervantes and slows the action of an intentionally dynamic and chaotic sequence.

The following inaccuracies in the Pandits' translation of the analysed sentence mirror the interpretation proposed by Jarvis. The English translator freely rendered

the fragment *llevándose tras sí al caballo y al caballero, que fué rodando muy maltrecho por el campo* as 'dragging horse and rider after it, and tumbling them over and over on the plain, in very evil plight', even though it could be translated as 'dragging after it the horse and the knight, who rolled much battered across the field'. In Jarvis's understanding, in the English translation both Quijote and Rocinante tumbled through the field, despite the fact that in the early modern Spanish text there is no plural form. Moreover, for an unknown reason, Jarvis substituted the original adjective *maltrecho* ('battered, damaged, injured') with the expression 'in very evil plight', prompting the Pandits to render it as *durgatiṃ prāpya*, lit. 'having reached misfortune'.

As a last point, some considerations can be made about the diastratic asset of specific sections from the English and Sanskrit translations and their relation with Cervantes's original text. After the attack against the windmills and the fall of Quijote, a humorous dialogue between the knight and his squire follows, in which Sancho exclaims:

> Cervantes
> […] ***¡Válame Dios!*** *—dijo Sancho—. ¿No le dije yo a **vuestra merced** que mirase bien lo que hacía* […]. (Rico 2015: 104)

> Jarvis
> […] **God save me**, quoth Sancho, did not I warn **you** to have a care of what you did […]. (Dimitrov 2019: 42)

> Shastri and Zadoo
> […] ***trāhi, trāhi****, vimṛśyakāryakaraṇe' haṃ **tvāṃ** pūrvam eva prābodhayam* | (Dimitrov 2019: 43)

In their translation of this passage, Shastri and Zadoo rendered the interjection 'God save me' as repeated *trāhi*, the second singular imperative form from the stem *trai-*, 'to protect, defend, preserve', omitting the address to the god. Moreover, the translations of Jarvis and Shastri and Zadoo seem to fail to convey specific nuances of the original text which enrich the overall flavour of every Cervantes's sentence. The honorific *vuestra merced* ('Your Grace') is omitted and substituted with direct *you / tvam* in both Jarvis's and the Pandits' renderings, which do not mirror the subordinated position of a servant to his master. Such evident or more subtle modalities in the *Quijote* are the key elements which enlighten the comical relation and interactions between the knight and his squire.

The same translatological imprecision concerning the different and humorous levels of the language used by the two characters is perceivable also in don Quijote's reply to Sancho:

> Cervantes
> ***Calla, amigo Sancho*** […]. (Rico 2015: 105)

Jarvis
Peace, friend Sancho [...]. (Dimitrov 2019: 42)

Shastri and Zadoo
śāntiṃ kuru, mitra sāṃcopāṃja | (Dimitrov 2019: 43)

Calla is the imperative form from the verb *callar*, 'to stay silent, to not speak', and, in its imperative form, it is still used even nowadays, in modern Spanish, as an idiomatic expression to express the command 'shut up!', with different degrees of harshness. Generally, Cervantes introduced such colloquial expressions in the linguistic repertoire of don Quijote on purpose, to mark the two faces of the character himself: the knight who employed the altisonant and magniloquent register proper of the chivalry tradition and its novels, and the minor landowner interacting with his servant, reducing him to silence by recurring to low and comical diastratic levels of the language. In fact, the omission of such nuances and linguistic jumps by Jarvis in his translation was heavily criticised, as it stripped Cervantes's novel of humour and vivacity. As noted by Henry Edward Watts, Jarvis' rendering is

> [...] dull, commonplace, and unhumorous [...] generally correct and judicious, but certainly not faithful, and it is not easy to discover why it has become so generally accepted, unless it is that Jarvis's dullness has served him for a warrant of morality. (Watts 1888: 12)[15]

Jarvis's pale translation of the excerpt quoted above as 'peace' was literally rendered by the Pandits as *śāntiṃ kuru*, 'make silence', although more suitable for conveying the comicality would have been, for instance, *tvadvadanaṃ / tvadmukhaṃ pidhehi / apidhehi*, 'shut your mouth'.

4 Concluding remarks

Summing up, as we have seen from the several examples quoted from the windmill fight episode and respective passages from the translations of Jarvis and Shastri and Zadoo, in general, the Pandits' rendering closely followed the English translation. However, the inaccuracies occurring in the Jarvis's version influenced the Sanskrit text and, supplemented with the further modifications that must have been introduced by Shastri and Zadoo due to the phonetic and syntactic differences between English and Sanskrit, resulted in an even further distancing from Cervantes's original. Moreover, the Pandits, perhaps in order to manage the textual complexity already present in Jarvis's version, split the text in several smaller units, simplifying the articulation of the diction, often sustained by an intricate syntactical and morphological frame. Such a solution resulted in a noticeable modification of the original structure of the text

---

15 For further details concerning the assessment of Jarvis's translation see also Dimitrov 2019: XVI–XVII.

and did not give justice to the overall complexity of *Don Quijote* as a literary text. The Sanskrit used by the Pandits is devoid of long compounds and operates with rather simple grammatical forms, in addition to a limited and well-measured vocabulary; these elements resulted nevertheless in a reasonably balanced and well-structured translation. However, because of relying on the English medium, it did not enlighten the extreme complexity and richness of the original and did not convey successfully the reality of the *Don Quijote* as a literary universe created by Cervantes.

Funding

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Hermina Cielas Leão https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4709-3043
David Pierdominici Leão https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6725-3219

References

Apte, Vaman Shivram. 1893. *The Student's English-Sanskrit Dictionary*. Bombay: Mrs. Radhabai Atmaram Sagoon.

Byron, William. 1978. *Cervantes: A Biography*. London: Cassell.

Cascardi, Anthony J., ed. 2002. *The Cambridge Companion to Cervantes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

CED = 1991. 'Caitiff'. In *Collins English Dictionary*. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

Dimitrov, Dragomir, ed. 2019. *Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra Ḍān Kvikṣoṭaḥ (Chapters I.2, I.3, I.8, I.10, I.16, I.17, I.18 & I.23). Translated from English into Sanskrit by Jagaddhar Zadoo & Nityanand Shastri*. Pune: Department of Pali, Savitribai Phule Pune University.

DLC = 1914. *Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana por la Real Academia Española*. Madrid: Imprenta de los Sucesores de Hernando.

Maurya, Vibha, transl. 2006. *Migel de Servāntes Don Kikhote*. Delhi: Confluence International.

Maurya, Vibha, transl. 2015. *Migel de Servāntes Don Kikhote (Lā Māṃcā ke Śūrvīr kī Gāthā)*. Delhi: Pairabel International.

McCrory, Donald. 2002. *No Ordinary Man: The Life and Times of Miguel de Cervantes*. London: Peter Owen Ltd.

MEC = 'Caitiff'. In *Middle English Compendium*. Accessed 26 September 2025. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED6478/track?counter=2&search_id=3382788

Monier-Williams, Monier. 2005. *A Sanskrit English Dictionary. Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.

OED = 'Caitiff'. In *Oxford English Dictionary*. Accessed 26 September 2025. https://www.oed.com/dictionary/caitiff_n?tab=factsheet#10655582

Pandita, S.N. 2001. 'Sir Aurel Stein and Kashmiri Scholars'. *Himalayan and Central Asian Studies* 5 (2): 54–60.

Pandita, S.N. 2002. *Western Indologists and Sanskrit Savants of Kashmir*. New Delhi: Siddharth Publications.

Pegum, Caroline. 2009. 'The Artistic and Literary Career of Charles Jervas (c. 1675–1739)'. MPhil Thesis. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Rico, Francisco, ed. 2015. *Miguel de Cervantes. Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Madrid: Real Academia Española.

Watts, Henry Edward. 1888. *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of La Mancha by Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. A New Edition done into English with Notes, Original and Selected, and a New Life of the Author by Henry Edward Watts. In Five Volumes. Vol. I. Biography; Criticism; Bibliography*. London: Bernard Quaritch.