

“TELL US IN PLAIN WORDS”:  
TEXTUAL IMPLICATIONS OF RE-LANGUAGING JOYCE

---

*“Pen is Champ”*

“Who’s he when he’s at home?” (*U4.340*). That depends on what you eat it with. (Trans)literally. For, indeed, the Russian translators render Molly’s question as “С чем это вообще едят?” [What do they eat it with?] (*UR 52*), and so does Valverde in Spanish: “¿Con qué se come eso?” (*US1 132*). In Subriat’s Spanish *Ulysses*, Molly’s question is translated as “¿De dónde salió eso?” (*US2 96*) and it resembles the French “D’où sort-il celui-là?” by Morel (*UF 63*). In Italian, the question is rendered by de Angelis as “Come lo chiamano in famiglia?” [What do they call [it] in family?] (*UI 64*) and it has the semantic range of both the Polish and the Czech translations: in Polish, “Co to za facet? Jak go nazywają ci, co go znają?” [Who’s that guy? What do they call him those who know him?] (*UPol 50*), and in Vymětal and Fastrová’s Czech, “Jak se ten člověk jmenuje po našem?” [What is this man called among us?] (*UC1 I 94*). The Czech translation by Skoumal offers a more literal solution: “Co to mezi námi děvaty znamená?” [What, between us, does it stand for?] (*UC2 55*). In the Portuguese translation, the staccato “Que é que é que é isto?” (*UPor 52*) falsifies Molly’s register of eloquence, and it explodes/obliterates it in the Spanish version by Tortosa: “No lo conocen ni en su casa a la hora de comer” (*US3 72*)<sup>1</sup>.

Molly’s question is in itself already an interlingual translation<sup>2</sup> and it

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Fritz Senn for laboriously transcribing these translations for me in 2004 for the “Bloomsday 100 Symposium” in Dublin.

<sup>2</sup> In his now classic definition of translation, Roman Jakobson (1992: 145 ff.) distinguishes between interlingual translation (“an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language”; also called “rewording”); intralingual translation (“an interpretation of verbal signs by

is worth remembering that Bloom's communication pattern in general, and in "Calypso" in particular, navigates through translations, mistranslations, decoding and mis-decoding of meaning(s), a pattern very well mastered by Molly as well. We see fluent, straightforward and unencumbered "translations," but we also see moments when the spouses ponder, probe, or skirt around meaning, not unlike translators who labor to capture signification behind performative decoys of lexical/semantic veils. Molly's "Mn" is expertly deciphered by her spouse to mean "No. She didn't want anything" (*U* 4.57-58), but, of course, we have only Bloom to translate it for us. That heart-slowng "Mrs Marion Bloom" (*U* 4.244) on the morning post envelope is equally expertly translated by Bloom though, a great tactician, he tests bed-wed Molly about the sender of the letter, not unlike Odysseus testing Penelope on *their* bed secret. But Bloom misses the meaning of Molly's pointing finger until she explicitly names her target: that book (*U* 4.324). He stalls when Molly points a word she wants explained; she has to ask him again by translating her original question: "Who's he when he's at home?" (*U* 4.340). Bloom's translation is all Greek to Molly and she famously demands plain words, mocking later his "from the Greek" (*U* 18.241). We remember her dissatisfaction with Bloom's jawbreaker of an explanation for "that word met something with hoses in it" which she recalls as "incarnation" (*U* 18.565-566). That Bloom's own words "can be improved on by a good translation" has already been noted by Fritz Senn in context of his discussion of the working of Bloom's mind. Senn continues: "So Joyce comes to his aid and [...] runs the show on his behalf, with transformations, transmutations, transubstantiations, and metamorphoses, with different contexts and styles and paratactic systems of correspondences" (Senn 1984: 158). Bloom's mind is always multi-tasking: as he is leafing through the *Ruby* book and chatting with Molly, the spokes of his mind mill through the concept of metempsychosis. That is, we see a translator at work, one who is mindful of his audience and thoughtfully supplements his translation of metempsychosis into reincarnation with examples of animals and nymphs, all accompanied by the smell of kidneys aptly "carnating" on the fire, smoke and all. Thus Bloom's very process of defining metempsychosis is a metempsychotic translation, whereby Bloom attempts to define the abstract "soul" of the concept by

means of other signs of the same language"); and intersemiotic translation ("an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems").

separating it from the “body” of the word that Molly cannot pronounce and transferring it onto “another body”, or “What they called nymphs, for example” (*U* 4.376-377)<sup>3</sup>.

*“Unusual polysyllables of foreign origin...”*

In “Penelope”, Molly’s “that word met something with hoses in it” and “incarnation” (*U* 18.565-566) pose obstacles to translators though, as we will see below, most manage to preserve at least some of the phonetic echoes of “metempsychosis”. Of Molly’s truncated “met” and “hoses”, only derivations of “met” manage to travel well into all languages, with the Spanish, Italian, and French providing fortuitous echoes of “hoses” in “cosa(s)” and “choses”. Thus, recalling Bloom’s “encarnación”, the Spanish Molly thinks about “esa palabra *mete* noséqué con *cosas*” (*US*2 759); for the Italian Molly, “incarnazione” is “quella parola *metti* non mi ricordo *cosa* dentro” (*UI* 713). In French, Molly remembers “l’incarnation” as “ce mot *mes* quoi *tempes* si *choses* dedans” (*UF* 836). In all three languages, Bloom’s word “reincarnation” appears also in “Calypso” and translators had only to repeat it (preferably in Molly-fashion rather than the “correct” one). But when the Polish Molly recalls “*mnie tam psy coś tam*” (*UPol* 534) [me the dogs something], the effect is deflated a few words later by “*wcienie*”, a synonym for the Latinate “*reinkarnacja*” favored in “Calypso”. It is highly speculative whether Polish readers will make the connection between original “*metempsychoza/ reinkarnacja*” in “Calypso” and its truncated version in “Penelope”. Using either of the terms consistently in both episodes, as is done in Russian, would increase the chance of readerly recognition. The Russian Molly recalls “то слово *метим* чего-там”

<sup>3</sup> In *Translation and Taboo*, chapter on “The Divided Self,” Douglas Robinson (1996) offers an elaboration on how the Hellenistic belief in the separability of body and soul “conditioned the mainstream Christian translation theory” by dualizing the text, which led to the “sense-for-sense translation invented by Jerome” and was “gradually instilled in [...] Christian translators as the only orthodox method of translation – the method whereby the abstract meaning or ‘soul’ of a text is separated from its carnal body (its individual words in their original word order, their original source-language connotations and collocations and mood and general source-language ‘feel’) and transferred to another (target-language) body. Translation became a kind of metempsychosis” (Robinson 1996: 63). “Metempsychotic translation becomes possible because the text’s soul or meaning or ‘ghost’ (*psuche*) is thought of as detachable from its verbal body and transferable across (*meta*) to another verbal body” (*ibid.*: 64).

(UR 526) [this word *metim* something] and “воплощения” [plural for “incarnation”] echoing Bloom’s “перевоплащение” (UR 52) [reincarnation] from “Calypso”<sup>4</sup>.

“...But to the Point”

“Translation” is a testy term when applied to Joyce’s writing and my task here to propose an alternative way of talking about the process. For somebody not immersed in translation studies, it may be useful to review the “various different varieties” of referring to translation in other languages. For instance, the Russian перевод, German *Übersetzen* and Polish *przekład* share the semantic range of *physical* passing or jumping over, transferring and adapting; Polish has also another term, *tłumaczenie*, or explanation<sup>5</sup>. The Greek compound μεταφράζω (“paraphrase”, “translate” and “consider after”) defines physical and *mental* processes carried by its richly polysemous element, the verb φράζω: “point out”, “show the way”, “make known the word to all”, “declare”, “explain”, “cultivate style or phrasing”, “give counsel”, “advise”, “suggest”, “think”, “consider”, “ponder”, as well as “plan”, “contrive”, “believe”, and “imagine”. Another verb, μεταφέρω (“carry across”, “transfer”, but also “divert”, “shift”, “change”) shares rhetorical range with the familiar noun μεταφορά in denoting “transference of a word to a new sense”. We also recall that *transfere* (or *vertere*) is Latin for “translate” (*transfere* also means “transplant”) and that Latin *translatio* refers to transference, especially of property. It’s old news, really, but a meditation (*trans*) on all these meanings brings to focus the complexity of *trans*-re-lations between the original and the trans-

<sup>4</sup> Attentive readers may notice that, unlike in the opening paragraph where I compare Molly’s sentence by citing the Italian, French, Polish, Russian, Portuguese, two Czech and three Spanish versions of Ulysses, in this section I am using only the Italian, French, Polish, Russian and Subirat’s Spanish version – the only copies I had access to at the time of expanding this essay for publication.

<sup>5</sup> The Latinate word “translacja” is also used, the Polish “-cja” being equivalent to the English “-tion”. “Przekład” names 1) the effect of the process of “trans-placement”, and 2) translation as a book (e.g. new translation by...). The verb “przekładać” refers to the process of rearranging, of re-positioning or re-placing or trans-planting of objects by changing their layout, but also to layering (e.g. cake with frosting; linen sheets with protective tissues, etc.). “Tłumaczenie” means literally “explanation”, and whereas in English we do not commonly refer to the process of explanation as “translation”, the Polish word “tłumaczenie” denotes both.

lated text (as translator “trans-re-lates” to both in *all* of the processes of φράζω). Of course, the process of lexical translocation bears on semantic trans-re-location of meaning as translators enter a transaction (Latin *negotium*) of sorts, negotiating the pitfalls of linguistic/textual transposition (Latin *trajectio*). Because the “trajectory” of any transposition can be precarious, translation partakes of “transgression”, (*violatio*, or *delictum*; Latin for “transgressor” is *maleficus*), an apt denomination for some of the effects of the translation process. To transgress (Latin *violare*, *delinquere*) while translating is as inevitable as it is easy. It is, of course, equally easy to point out other translators’ delinquencies – a “gleeful” pursuit, “deeply gratifying to our malevolence” (Senn 1984: 5).

Given the context, I want to propose that such terms as “trans-semantification” or “re-languaging” (rather than Jakobson’s “rewording”) reflect more closely the complexities of processes connoted by μεταφράζω, *transfere*, *Übersetzen*, *переводить*,  *tłumaczyć*, *traduit*, et cetera<sup>6</sup>. At the “Bloomsday 100” translation sessions in Dublin my generous co-panelists commented on the term “trans-semantification” and pointed out that much more happens when a work of literature is being transferred from one language/culture to another than just transposing its semantic layer; no one would argue with that. To clarify my terms, I start with the premise that the term “translation” has outlived its utility; it has come to denote largely an interlingual transference of a work either via simple lexical substitution, as in literal, word-for-word transfer, or a more complex sense-for-sense transfer (often both, depending on textual demands imposed by the original). Note that in my description of the Blooms’ interaction in “Calypso” I deliberately use the term “translation” rather loosely, in all three senses of Jakobson’s definition, to denote a variety of processes covered by this umbrella word. Many critics and philosophers have offered theories and definitions and many more have devised a variety of metaphors for translation – Benjamin, Derrida<sup>7</sup> – but the term remains elusive and very broad. I’d like to suggest that Roman Ingarden’s

<sup>6</sup> I have proposed these terms at the translation panel organized by Rosa Maria Bosinelli and co-chaired by Fritz Senn during the 2004 International James Joyce Symposium in Dublin. I am indebted to all the participants for the spirited exchange which gave me the opportunity to articulate the practical underpinnings of what it means to translate Joyce.

<sup>7</sup> I discussed aspects of Benjamin’s famous essay, “The Task of the Translator” (1923), and Derrida’s (1988) take on it, in my tribute to the Polish translator of *Ulysses* (Wawrzycka 2004: 140-142).

distinction between translating scholarly/ philosophical works and translating works of literature offers a venue for re-tooling traditional terminology<sup>8</sup>. By proposing the term “trans-semanticization” to name the process of transferring a *literary work of art* into another language, I wish to denote the complexity of *literary re-linguaging* that, in spite of replacing lexical surface of a literary work, manages to attend to sound, rhythm and semantic coloration of words, phrases, and syntactical units of the original, as well as to take cognizance of cultural references embedded in lexical structures (e.g. names, rhetorical formations, stylistic repetition colloquialisms or invectives) by scrupulously *re-fostering* them in target language even – or particularly – at the risk of busting the normative boundaries of that language. Trans-semanticization means that the very *literariness* of a literary work is “carried across” and re-created in another language, while largely accounting for the aspects of all aesthetically significant strata and for the “polyphonic harmony” in which these strata co-exist in the original<sup>9</sup>. Other critics have also proposed to revise or expand terminology for describing and defining the process I call trans-semanticization – for instance, we have “translation equivalences” defined by Anton Popović, “tropological translations” described by Douglas Robinson, Pound’s “interpretive translation”, or translational “presuppositions” proposed by Michel Riffaterre<sup>10</sup>, to name just a few. Upon closer scrutiny, however, conceptual

<sup>8</sup> I am following a distinction made by Roman Ingarden in “On translations”, where he discusses differences in translating scholarly/philosophical works (that aim at cognition and therefore emphasize lexical and semantic precision) and translating works of literature (that aim at preserving the polyphonic inter-stratum harmony and require that, in addition to lexical and semantic precision, great attention be paid to preserving aesthetically relevant dimension). See Ingarden (1991: esp. 133-152, 177-184).

<sup>9</sup> For Ingarden, the stratum of “word sounds and phonetic formations” plays a cardinal role in determining how lively and richly they will evoke the “represented objects” along with their “corresponding emotional coloring” and/or expression of “psychological states of the speaking subjects” (Ingarden 1991: 139). The stratum of “semantic units” is also vital to the layer of represented objects as it determines their quality, metaphorical or non-metaphorical meanings, emotive power and other “aesthetically relevant qualities” of language (*ibid.*: 138). “Represented objects” (people, events, situations) are crucial in attracting reader’s attention/interest and in evoking “positive or negative (friendly or hostile) responses”; those “objects” must possess the capacity to “move” the reader and evoke fondness for them (*ibid.*: 137). Finally, “schematized aspects” of represented objects fulfill the function of visualization, of enabling the mental looking or considering an object/situation and, obviously, such mental regarding of potential appearances would not happen without the first two strata of lexical and semantic units. That the objects appear to the reader only in their schematized aspects means that the reader “manages their con-

framework of those terms seems to parallel Roman Ingarden's polyphonic strata that constitute the unique identity of a literary work of art. Trans-semantification understood in all these terms implies that translatorial inattention to these strata, that is, to a work's linguistic, aesthetic, or sociopolitical dimensions, compromises the preservation (in the target language) of its core, its impact, its relevance, and its deeper modes of signification.

### *"Orthographical"*

Joyce's own process of re-linguaging of English bears significantly on any discussion pertinent to translation and trans-semantification<sup>11</sup>. From "Aeolus" to "Cyclops" to "Ithaca", the examples are famously numerous though they are equally prolific in *Dubliners* and *Portrait*. Joyce's earlier stylistic experiments include working with repetition, malapropisms, "scrupulous meanness", and my discussion of these salient textual features in *Dubliners* had lead me to conclude that re-linguaging Joyce requires a "scholarly, philological attention to Joyce's lexical layer whose structures (repetitions, alliterations, rhythm) inform semantic layer, which in turn informs the all the remaining dimensions of the text: aesthetic, symbolic, historical, political, and so on"<sup>12</sup>. Clearly, to mistreat Joyce's work on the lexical stratum (to continue with my Ingardenian terminology) is to fail famously on all the remaining strata. Like other Joyce-translation scholars,

cretization not in perceptual but in imaginary material", unlike "in theatrical performances where appearances [aspects] are concretized [and] made tangible by the actors and props" (*ibid.*: 137).

<sup>10</sup> See Bassnett's discussion of Popović's linguistic, paradigmatic, stylistic, and textual equivalences (Bassnett 1991: 25 ff. and Popović 1976); the excellent chapter, "The Tropics of Translation", in *The Translator's Turn* (Robinson 1991: 127-193); Hollander's analysis of Pound's *Seafarer* (Hollander 1959: 211-213); and Riffaterre (1992: 205-208) on stylistic, socio-cultural and "literariness-inducing" presuppositions.

<sup>11</sup> Stephen Yao (2002) sees this process in a wider context of Modernist experiment, whereas Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli (2001), Serenella Zanotti (1999; 2001), John McCourt (1999), Carla Marengo Vaglio (1994), Giorgio Melchiori (1984; 1995) and Corinna del Greco Lobner (1989) analyze it in terms of exile. In addition to Senn 1984, see also Gordon (2004: 89-90, 145, 175-76), and Vincent Deane's (1998) discussion of Joyce's English in "Looking after Sense".

<sup>12</sup> See Wawrzycka (1998: 82). Though I limited my discussion to *Dubliners* only, Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli reached similar conclusion in her essay "'Who is she when she is not at home?' Molly's Journey through the Italian Language and Culture" (Bollettieri Bosinelli 1998).

notably Fritz Senn and Rosa Maria Bosinelli, or, from further a-field, classicists such as Reuben Brower<sup>13</sup>, I believe that critical comparisons of multilingual versions of the same work help to expand our reading and re-reading of the original. Fritz Senn's book, *Inductive Scrutinies*, makes it clear in chapter after chapter that, "[t]ranslations are excellent testing grounds: departures from the original arrangement can pinpoint some of its oddity" (Senn 1995: 99) on the one hand, and, on the other, that erroneous or plain wrong translations "are the most Proteanly revelatory ones" (*ibid.*: 144).

Take, for instance, Eveline's tortured "Still they seemed to have been rather happy then" (*D* 36). Nothing remarkable about this sentence until one tries to render in another language while trying to preserve (as aesthetically/textually relevant) all layers of deferral buried in this lexical/semantic construct. But the sentence, as I found out from the correction of my own rendition into Polish, is reducible to "they were rather happy"<sup>14</sup>. Since my trans-semantification met with censorious editorial intervention, I learned to leave the (fantastically malleable) rules of the Polish grammatical, syntactic and conditional modes alone, never mind Eveline's grief and Joyce's languaging processes to imply it. To be sure, it is not easy to "translate" this sentence *as Joyce wrote it*: one has to re-language it to convey, ultimately, the depth of Eveline's denial buried in the syntax or to settle for a simpler rendition. Mere "translation" is rather happy with the reduced sentence; trans-semantification, though, would accommodate the process of re-languaging (even of the *target* language where necessary) and preserve deeper modes and aspects of Eveline's thinking. Trans-semantification opens up and expands the range of the term "translation" by indicating that "translated" text can accommodate and re-create salient features of the source language rather than sand them down into oblivion. The Italian Eveline "pareva che [...] fossero

<sup>13</sup> Senn's work on Homer/Joyce (1989), his *Dislocations* (Senn 1984), and his numerous other pieces such as "Seven Against *Ulysses*" (Senn 1966/67), demonstrate abundantly the value of interlingual comparative readings; see also Bollettieri Bosinelli 1990, and "Seven Agamemnon" (Brower 1959).

<sup>14</sup> My translation was never published (admittedly, I gave it only one try); most corrections of my rendition involved "sanding down" of the wording/phrasing I tried to preserve by replicating Joyce's non-standard usage. The 1958 Polish version by Wojciechowska and the 2005 translation by Batko reproduce some of the modality of Eveline's thought, though I'd argue that Polish can accommodate a much closer rendition of Joyce's phrasing. Editors, however, would most likely cut it as too tentative, redundant or non-standard.

stati abbastanza felici” (*DI* 68) and the French one thinks that “il semblaient bien qu’ils avaient été assez heureux” (*DF* 83); both renditions are particularly successful in capturing the modality of Eveline’s thinking. But, like the Polish Eveline, the Spanish one recalls that they “parecían felices” (*DS* 34) [appeared/seemed happy] and the Russian one thinks simply: “жилося хорошо” (*DR* 32) [life was good]. Traditore.

Or take Gabriel’s revealing syntactic lapsus designed to offer a glimpse of the working of Gabriel-the-writer’s mind: “He asked himself what is a woman standing on the stairs in the shadow, listening to distant music, a symbol of” (*D* 210). In other languages, Joyce’s “a symbol of” is frequently rendered as a verb “symbolize” and, invariably, the syntax conforms to the standards of a given target language. One notable exception is the 2005 Polish version which omits this sentence entirely. It could be just a printer’s error but, admittedly, Joyce’s syntax – i.e., the point of this sentence – is difficult to replicate in Polish. The 1958 Polish edition opts for a perfect literary language: “Zastanawiał się, co może w tej chwili symbolizować kobieta” (*DPI* 189) that, in back-translation, reads as “He pondered what *could a woman symbolize* at this moment”. The Russian version also opts for a standard language, though it preserves the noun and introduces a syntactical revision that can also be reproduced in Polish: “Он спросил себя *СИМВОЛОМ ЧЕГО* была эта женщина стоящая в мрое” (*DR* 190) [He asked himself *a symbol of* what was the woman standing in the shadow]. In Italian, the syntax seems to replicate Gabriel’s “almost” correct English: “Si chiedeva *cosa potesse mai simboleggiare* una donna in piedi sulle scale nell’ombra” (*DI* 247) [He asked himself *what(ever) could symbolize a woman* standing on staircase in the shadow]. The Spanish version preserves “symbol” as a noun: “Se preguntó de qué podía ser símbolo una mujer” (*DS* 200) [He asked himself *symbol of what could be a woman*]. The French version is successful in preserving Gabriel’s word order but it can only render his thought, again, as standard language, courtesy of the final verb: “Il se demanda *ce qu’une femme, debout dans l’escalier, écoutant une lointaine musique, symbolise*” (*DF* 331) [He asked himself *what a woman [...] symbolized*].

Joyce’s superbly structured last sentence of “The Dead” with its haunting chiasmus “falling faintly [...] and faintly falling” (*D* 224) suffers greatly in most “translations”, though the Spanish version is superior in reproducing Joyce’s chiasmus: “la nieve leve [...] y [...] leve la nieve” (*DS* 213). The Italian (*DI* 261), the French (*DF* 350), the Russian (*DR* 202)

and the two Polish versions (*DPI* 201; *DP2* 197) inexplicably forgo any attempt of preserving the chiasmus for the sake of a much more straightforward, if vaguely poetic, language<sup>15</sup>. All these renditions are somewhat flat; they do little to transfer and recreate all aspects of Joyce's syntactical and rhetorical layers that enhance the aesthetics of the story's coda. Save for the Spanish version, trans-semantification process seems incomplete in other languages, as if translators settled for "just translating" the sense – which they did – but gave up on rendering the complex figurative and rhetorical layers with sensitivity to their integrity.

Preservation of the dynamics of interlingual transfer is equally important in the case of colloquial language in general and in the special case of colloquialisms represented by invectives. For instance, in "An Encounter", the attack "*Swaddlers! Swaddlers!*" (*D* 22) is largely untranslatable, as illustrated by the Italian version which retains the original "Swaddlers!" and footnotes the meaning (*DI* 54). For the most part, though, trans-semantification allows translators to reach solutions that can successfully replicate the idiolect of the original in their respective languages. One Polish version renders the two words as "Heretyki! Kacerze!" (*DPI* 17) [Heretics! Heretics!]<sup>16</sup> and another one as "Kocia wiara! Kocia wiara!" (*DP2* 17) [Cats' faith! Cats' faith! – an inexplicable choice that carries no sense that the boys are being insulted]. The Spanish version goes for Quakers in "Cuá, cuá, cuáqueros" (*DS* 20), whereas the French reproduces the insult by repeating "Parpaillots!" (*DF* 62) and so does the Russian by repeating "Нехристи!" (*DR* 19) [literally, nonchristians; figuratively, shameless perpetrators].

<sup>15</sup> Substantial changes in the last sentence in both Polish version qualify as re-writes rather than "translations", let alone trans-semantifications. The 1958 version by Wojciechowska reads in back-translation as: "He heard the snow quietly flowing down on the universe and his soul slowly died as if the last hour came for the all the living and the dead" (in Polish: "Słyszał śnieg cicho spływający na wszechświat i dusza jego zamierała z wolna, jakby nadeszła ostatnia godzina dla wszystkich żywych i zmarłych", *DPI* 201).

The 2005 version by Batko inverts and alters Joyce's words even further: "Gabriel's soul was slowly dying; he heard the snow flow softly from some cosmic space, as if from there the end was coming for everyone – the living [ones] and the dead" (in Polish: "Dusza Gabriela zamierała z wolna; słyszał, jak śnieg, spływa miękko z jakiejś kosmicznej przestrzeni, jakby nadciągał stamtąd na oświat kres dla wszystkich – żyjących i zmarłych", *DP2* 197).

<sup>16</sup> Polish "Kacerze" (derived from *Cathar*) is a synonym for "heretics" and the Polish language uses the two words interchangeably making Wojciechowska's rendition particularly fortuitous.

And then there is Miss Ivors, with her biting nationalism and an agenda to get Gabriel for his lack of political spine summed up in her “I didn’t think you were a West Briton” (D 188), repeated again: “West Briton!” (D 190). Insults often rely on repetition though repetition doesn’t always survive a transfer to a target language since not all languages accommodate repetition equally well. In the 1958 Polish Dubliners, “West Briton” becomes “anglophile” in the first instance and “disgusting Englishman” in the second<sup>17</sup>. The 2005 Polish version features Miss Ivors’ descriptive “English(men)-sympathizer” repeated as “Disgusting Brit”<sup>18</sup>. In Spanish we see “pro-inglés” twice; the French text repeats “Angliche!” and both the Italian and the Russian texts use, like the 1958 Polish version, the word “anglophile” to convey the insult<sup>19</sup>. Thus, by re-linguaging “West Briton,” the translators have reproduced the insult to resonate in their particular socio-linguistic environments marked by different nationalistic dynamics. The Spanish solution is interesting, considering that “pro-” is highly charged and prone to follow the vagaries of political/historical winds (of any culture, really). Interestingly, the word “Anglophile”, evidently negatively charged in some European languages, does not even exist in the OED (though “Anglomaniac” does, and so does “Anglophobe”).

Clearly much more than “translation” went into producing the foreign idiomatic invectives; via the process of trans-semantification, the translators were able to reflect more adequately the complex cultural references to be “carried over” from one lexical/ semantic system into another. The trite dictum that idioms do not travel well in translation can be re-contextualized: it might be more accurate to say that say that idioms and invectives are never really “translated” but rather, though the process of trans-semantification, they are re-linguaged for their situational field of meaning in target languages.

<sup>17</sup> “Nie myślałam że jest pan anglofilem” (DPI 169) [I didn’t think you were an anglophile] and “Anglik przebrzydły!” (DPI 171) [Filthy-disgusting Englishman].

<sup>18</sup> “Nie sądziłam że jest pan takim sympatykiem Anglików” (DP2 166) [I didn’t think you were such an English(men)-sympathizer] and “Wstrętny Angol!” (DP2 168) [Disgusting Brit].

<sup>19</sup> “No sabía que se había vuelto usted pro-inglés” (DS 179), “¡Pro-inglés!” (DS 180). “Je ne pensais que vous étiez Angliche” (DF 298) and “Angliche!” (DF 301). “Non credevo che foste un anglofilo” (DI 224) and “Anglofilo!” (DI 226). Russian: “Я не знала что вы ангофил” (DR 170) [I didn’t know you were an anglophile] and “Англофил!” (DR 172) [Anglophile!].

*“She had interrogated constantly...”*

And we can see this also in the examples of Molly’s multilingual “Who is he when he’s at home?” For, indeed, no translator has actually “translated” Molly’s question. To do so, they would have to re-state it in target languages and allow their target readers to ponder the identity of a home-dweller that Molly is asking about. Absurd? Not really. The English language readers recognize Molly’s “question” as an idiolectic re-statement of her previous request for explanation (“What does that mean?”) colored by the hilarious “him” that she hears in Bloom’s vocalization (or is it his imitation of her initial rendition?) of “metempsychosis”. So Molly’s question isn’t really translated; instead, a more scrupulous process of trans-semantification has allowed the translators to re-language it whereby, by foregoing the physical/lexical layer of Molly’s question, they have preserved its spirit. “True translation is metempsychosis.”<sup>20</sup>

*Radford University, Virginia (USA)*

### *Works Cited*

- Bassnett, Susan ([1980] 1991). *Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Benjamin, Walter ([1923] 1992). “The Task of the Translator”. In Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet eds. (1992). 71-82.
- Bollettieri Bosinelli, Rosa Maria (1990). “Beyond Translation: Italian Re-writings of *Finnegans Wake*”. *Joyce Studies Annual*, 1: 142-161.
- Bollettieri Bosinelli, Rosa Maria (1998). “Who is she when she is not at home? Molly’s Journey through the Italian Language and Culture”. In Ruth Frehner and Ursula Zeller eds. (1998). 444-460.
- Bollettieri Bosinelli, Rosa Maria (2001). “Joyce Slipping Across the Borders of English: The Stranger in Language”. *JJQ* 38 (3/4): 395- 409.
- Brower, Reuben A. ed. (1959). *On Translation*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Brower, Reuben A. (1959). “Seven Agamemnonns”. In Reuben A. Brower ed. (1959). 173-195.
- Deane, Vincent. “Looking after Sense; Taking Stock of Joyce’s English”. In Ruth Frehner and Ursula Zeller eds. (1998). 375-397.

<sup>20</sup> Ulrich von Willamowitz-Moellendorff (1925), in a preface to his translation of Euripides’ *Hippolytus*, titled “Was ist Übersetzen?”.

- Del Greco Lobner, Corinna (1989). *James Joyce's Italian Connection*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P.
- Derrida, Jacques (1988). *The Ear of the Other. Otobiography, Transference, Translation*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P.
- Frehner, Ruth and Ursula Zeller eds. (1998). *A Collideorscape of Joyce. Festschrift for Fritz Senn*. Dublin: Lilliput.
- Gordon, John (2004). *Joyce and Reality. The Empire Strikes Back*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP.
- Hollander, John (1959). "Versions, Interpretations, Performances". In Reuben A. Brower ed. (1959). 203-231.
- Ingarden, Roman ([1955] 1991). "On Translations". Trans. Jolanta W. Wawrzycka. *Analecta Husserliana*, 33: 131-192.
- Jakobson, Roman ([1959] 1992). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation". In Schulte and Biguenet (1992). 144-151.
- Joyce, James ([1929] 1948). *Ulysse*. Trans. Auguste Morel, rev. Valery Larbaud, Stuart Gilbert and James Joyce. Paris: Gallimard. (*UF*)
- Joyce, James (1930). *Odyseus*. Trans. Ladislav Vymětal (vol. 1 and 3) and Jarmila Fastrová (vol. 2). Prague: Václav Petr. (*UC1*)
- Joyce, James (1945). *Ulises*. Trans. José Salas Subirat. Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda Editor. (*US2*)
- Joyce, James ([1958] 1991). *Dublinczycy*. Trans. Kalina Wojciechowska. Warsaw: Oskar. (*DPI*)
- Joyce, James (1966). *Ulisses*. Trans. Antônio Houaiss. Silveira: Civilização Brasileira. (*UPor*)
- Joyce, James (1969). *Dubliners: Text, Criticism, and Notes*. Eds. Robert Scholes and A. Walton Litz. New York: Viking Press. (*D*)
- Joyce, James (1974). *Dublinois*. Trans. Jacques Aubert. Paris: Gallimard. (*DF*)
- Joyce, James (1974). *Dublineses*. Trans. Guillermo Cabrera-Infante. Madrid: Alianza. (*DS*)
- Joyce, James (1976). *Odyseus*. Trans. Aloys Skoumal. Prague: Odeon. (*UC2*)
- Joyce, James (1976). *Ulises*. Trans. José María Valverde. Barcelona: Lumen. (*US1*)
- Joyce, James (1978). *Gente di Dublino*. Trans. Franca Cancogni. Milan: Mondadori. (*DI*)
- Joyce, James (1986). *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*. Ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior. London: The Bodley Head. (*U*)
- Joyce, James ([1960] 1988). *Ulisse*. Trans. Giulio de Angelis. Milan: Mondadori. New edition based on Joyce 1986. (*UI*)
- Joyce, James (1992). *Ulisses*. Trans. Maciej Słomczyński. Revised and corrected by the Translator. Bygdoszcz: Pomorze. (*UPol*)
- Joyce, James (1993). *Uliss*. Trans. Viktor Hinkis and Sergej Horuŭij. With a commentary by Sergej Horuŭij. Moscow: Respublika. (*UR*)
- Joyce, James (1993). *Dublincy*. Trans. Igor' K Romanovič *et al.* Moscow: Znak. (*DR*)

- Joyce, James (1999). *Ulyses*. Trans. Francisco García Tortosa and María Luisa Venegas. Madrid: Cátedra. (US3)
- Joyce, James (2005). *Dublińczycy*. Trans. Zbigniew Batko. Kraków: Znak. (DP2)
- Marengo Vaglio, Carla (1994). "Trieste as a Linguistic Melting Pot". In Claude Jacquet and Jean Michel Rabaté (eds.), *James Joyce 3: Joyce et l'Italie*. Paris: Lettres Modernes. 55-74.
- McCourt, John (1999). *James Joyce: A Passionate Exile*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Melchiori, Giorgio (1984). *Joyce in Rome*. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Melchiori, Giorgio (1995). *Joyce's Feast of Languages: Seven Essays and Ten Notes*. Ed. by Franca Ruggieri, *Joyce Studies in Italy* 4. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Popović, Anton (1976). *A Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton, Alberta: Department of Comparative Literature, U of Alberta (referenced in Bassnett).
- Riffaterre, Michael ([1985] 1992). "Transposing Presuppositions on the Semiotics of Literary Translation". In Schulte and Biguenet (1992). 204-217.
- Robinson, Douglas (1991). *The Translator's Turn*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP.
- Robinson, Douglas (1996). *Translation and Taboo*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP.
- Schulte, Rainer and John Biguenet eds. (1992). *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- Senn, Fritz (1966/67). "Seven Against Ulysses". *JJQ*, 4 (3): 170-193.
- Senn, Fritz (1984). *Joyce's Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation*. Ed. by John Paul Riquelme. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Senn, Fritz (1989). "Anagnostic Probes". *European Joyce Studies*, 1: 37-61.
- Senn, Fritz (1995). *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*. Ed. by Christine O'Neill. Dublin: Lilliput.
- Willamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von, "Was ist Übersetzen?" (1925). In André Lefevere ed. and trans. (1992). *Translation/ History/ Culture*. London and New York: Routledge. 33-34.
- Wawrzycka, Jolanta W. (1998). "Text At the Crossroads: Multilingual Transformations of James Joyce's *Dubliners*". In Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli and Harold F. Mosher, Jr. (eds.), *ReJoycing: New Readings of Dubliners*. Lexington: The UP of Kentucky. 68-84.
- Wawrzycka, Jolanta W. (2004). "Joyce *en slave*/Joyce Enclave: The Joyce of Maciej Słomczyński – A Tribute". In Ellen Carol Jones and Morris Beja (eds.), *Twenty-First Joyce*. Gainesville: UP of Florida. 137-156.
- Yao, Steven G. (2002). *Translation and the Languages of Modernism: Gender, Politics, Language*. New York: Palgrave.
- Zanotti, Serenella (1999). "Per un ritratto dell'artista 'italianato': note sull'italiano di James Joyce". *Studi Linguistici Italiani*, 25 (1): 16-64.
- Zanotti, Serenella (2001). "An Italianate Irishman: Joyce and the Languages of Trieste". *JJQ*, 38 (3/4): 411-430.