

# THE POLYLOGUE PROJECT

## ERRORS: LOTS IN TRANSLATION



ERIK BINDERVOET, TIM CONLEY, ROBBERT-JAN HENKES, ERIKA MIHÁLYCSA ELENA PĂCURAR, GUILLERMO SANZ GALLEGO, FRITZ SENN, ENRICO TERRINONI, JOLANTA WAWRZYCZKA

**Abstract:** This collective piece [edited by F. Senn, E. Mihálycsa and J. Wawrzycka], the work of nine authors and covering some ten languages, examines the creative possibilities of translation to invent analogous forms to the broad range of (volitional) errors found in Joyce's text – lapses, aural/semantic slippage, defects, errors, misquotes. It also addresses the inevitable prioritizing, in translation, of either some existing coincidence (homography / homophony) in the TL, or of the original's signified – a choice that is as opportunistic as it is ideological. Since one of the most radical and aesthetically challenging features of the Joycean text is its co-opting of chance and error as principles of composition, the present glosses attempt to trace the translation text's possibilities to invent similar occasions for lateral growth, "portals of discovery" to breach expectations of narrative, syntactic and stylistic correctness and coherence.

**Resumo:** Este projeto coletivo [editado por F. Senn, E. Mihálycsa e J. Wawrzycka], trabalho de nove autores e que cobre umas dez línguas, examina as possibilidades criativas de tradução na invenção de formas análogas à ampla gama de erros (volitivos) encontrados no texto de Joyce – lapsos, escorregadelas fonéticas / semânticas, imperfeições, erros e citações erradas. Também trata da priorização inevitável, em tradução, por alguma coincidência (de homografia / homofonia) existente na língua alvo, ou pelo significado do original – uma escolha que é tão oportunista quanto ideológica. Dado que um dos traços mais radicais e esteticamente desafiadores do texto joyceano é sua cooptação do acaso e do erro como princípios de composição, estas glosas buscam investigar as possibilidades textuais de tradução na invenção de situações semelhantes em prol de uma expansão lateral do texto, "portais de descoberta" cujo fim é romper com expectativas de correção e coerência narrativas, sintáticas e estilísticas.

**Keywords:** Chance; Error; Homophony / Homography; Lapse; Parapraxis.

**Palavras-chave:** Acaso; erro; homofonia / homografia; lapso; ato falho.

Errors are of structural importance in *Ulysses*, contributing to the growth of a plural, dialogic text characterized by radical indeterminacy and lateral proliferation of meaning. Recent critical analysis in the field of Joycean studies has insisted on Joyce's aesthetic progress by which he systematically co-opted chance, error and "miswriting" as principles of composition and publication. The master of silence, exile and punning used errors and slips as one of the most salient ways of exposing the unreliability of linguistic expression and communication, to the extent that *Ulysses* must often appear to the reader as a tissue of mishearing, missaying and unwitting *double entendre*. These errors often present themselves as "portals of discovery", as Stephen Dedalus calls them in the Library episode (9.229), opening on language/textuality. The strategy of the slipping, lapsarian tongue is woven into the structure of the novel; instances of both inadvertent and volitional aural/semantic slippage, sliding signification disclose tensions at work in the text where language *stumbles*, soliciting the reader's *understumbling*, to use a common Dublin joke exploited in *Ulysses*, prefiguring at times the word-ing strategies of *Finnegans Wake*.

Many of the Joycean errors have fallen prey to the corrective urge of early printers and editors, having only been restored by the Gabler edition. In addition, especially early translators worked under the assumption that any erroneous or odd solution in a translation text will be considered a transmissional error and held down to the translator's defective skills, whereas in the original they are legitimated by the author's signature. More recent translations, however, aided by accumulating critical insight, have become increasingly aware of the importance of Joycean anomalies and *dislocutions* as portals of discomfiture, and more linguistically and stylistically daring in their attempts to approximate them.

For translation purposes errors, mistakes, lapses, *bona fide* puns, misunderstandings, defects ("high grade ha"), though different in origin, pose the same problem, that some appreciably equivalent verbal coincidences have to be called up or invented. At the May 2010 Zurich Translation Workshop we enlisted examples of errors taken in the broadest sense, from typos and lapses to stylistic fumbles and linguistic oddities that can only with some sleight of hand be categorized as "error", hoping to elicit answers as to how translation texts can problematize errors. We asked our respondents to address the possibilities of creating similar linguistic occasions in their target languages – a task made all the more onerous by the fact that a great many of these errors are echoed through the *Ulysses* text, asking for a nodal translation practice. The contributors to this section of the Joyce issue of *Scientia Traductionis* have tried to tackle the same questions. Inevitably, the discussion shows that we do not all have the same idea as to what the prime task at hand is – small wonder transla-

tors go different ways, both opportunistically (what possibilities are available?) and ideologically (what deserves priority).

Our first example is one of the most telling lapses, exploited through multiple echoes through *Ulysses*. In “Lotus Eaters” Bloom receives a secret letter from the typist Martha Clifford which displays a conspicuous typo:

**1. I called you naughty boy because I do not like that other world. Please tell me what is the real meaning of that word? (5.245)**

Translators into languages not lucky enough to have near-homophonous words for “word” and “world” are forced to choose between tacitly correcting Martha’s typo – and losing the memorable lapse which echoes in Bloom’s interior monologues, getting entangled with thoughts of life, love and death – and reproducing some kind of slip offered by the target language, with semantic reverberations often worlds removed from those found in the original.

The substitution of “world” for “word” seems a likely mistyping in English; the letters r and l are found next to each other on typewriter keyboards. This circumstance also forces translation versions to take an opportunistic turn, looking for possible homography/homophony in the target language. Coincidentally, translators are also brought to consider the issue, exactly how ungrammatical/uneducated Martha’s letter should be rendered in translation.

That “word” by one single intrusive letter “l” is expanded into a “world” plays into Joyce’s (and potentially every writer’s) hands: fiction is, after all, creating worlds out of mere words. This makes the momentous low key change even more significant, perhaps even more so when that self-same letter “l” is taken out of Bloom’s name (“L. Boom”, 16.1260). A potent letter. The first recurrence of this essential error, in “Hades”, testifies to this: “There is another world after death named hell. I do not like that other world she wrote. No more do I. Plenty to see and hear and feel yet” (6.1001).

### GERMAN/FRENCH (Fritz Senn)

... weil ich das andere Wort nicht leiden kann. Sage mir, welches die wirkliche Bedeutung dieses Wortes ist. (G/G 91)

Obviously Goyert did not notice a mistake or else he tacitly corrected an apparent misprint (which was also the case in many editions). The effect is that Martha merely wants to know the meaning of a disturbing word. So there is no trace of *world* which, however, occurs in “Hades”, without precedent: “Ich kann die andere *Welt* nicht leiden” (G/G 133). Such oversights are more common in the early translations that were done without the help of commentaries, concordances or electronic retrieval.

... weil ich von den andern Welten nichts wissen mag. Sag mir doch bitte was das für eine Bedeutung ist die das Wort hat. (G/W 108)

No reader will probably guess at a mistake, especially since *Welten* is

in the plural and does not seem to be linked with *Wort*. In German the two terms are far apart, even if perhaps remotely similar. The same may apply to French, where *monde* and *mot* are phonetically closer than graphically. It takes more of an effort to substitute “-nde” for “-t”.

... parce que je n'aime pas cet autre monde-là. S'il vous plaît dites-moi exactement ce que veut dire ce mot-là. (F/M 76)

... parce que je n'aime pas ce mont-là. Je vous prie de me dire quel est le vrais sens de ce mot. (F/A 114)

The addition of “-là” helps to reinforce the similarity.

### ITALIAN (Enrico Terrinoni)

T'ho chiamato bambino cattivo perché non mi piace quando parli in quell'altro mondo. Per favore dimmi che significa davvero quando parli a quel modo (I/T 102)

... perché quell'altro mondo non mi piace. Dimmi per piacere cosa vuol poi dire veramente quella parola\*. (I/DA 99)

[\*footnote: Errore dattilografico di Martha per modo (in inglese world e word)]

My copyeditor tried her best to correct my volitional error here. In order to explain what I have done with this tricky passage, I need to comment briefly on my predecessor's choice. His *quell'altro mondo non mi piace* translates directly as “I do not like that other world”. Unfortunately, by doing so he creates a perfectly understandable sentence, making us think that she [Martha] actually despises “that other world”. This obfuscates the revelatory mistake, and no footnote will make up for the loss. What I did was play with the *modo/mondo* (“way/world”) near-homography, using the latter to recreate a mistake: *parli in quell'altro mondo* (“speak in that other world”). In this way, readers will immediately spot that the word *mondo* (“world”) has been wrongly used instead of *modo* (“way”), for what Martha actually wanted to say was presumably *parli in quell'altro modo*. Of course, I am losing something here, and precisely, from a theoretical point of view, I am transferring the reference to lexicon (*word*) to a discursive level (ways of speaking). But, to compensate, I am keeping the term “world” as in the original, alongside the parallelism between ways of speaking and ways of being in the world.

### SPANISH (Guillermo Sanz Gallego)

... porque no me gusta esa otra palabra. Por favor dime cuál es el verdadero significado de esa palabra. (S/S 107)

... porque no me gusta ese otro mundo. Por favor dime qué quiere decir de verdad eso otro. (S/V 129)

... porque no me gusta ese otro mudo. Por favor dime ¿qué quiere decir de verdad ese nombre? (S/T 87)

The original text in English contains an error or mistyping, namely the reference to “world” in the first sentence, which confuses the reader. The interpretation of the passage becomes clear at the end of the second sentence, because it ends with “word”. Accordingly, the characterisation of Martha Clifford is influenced by this slip of the pen, and is portrayed as someone whose written communicative skills could be improved.

Salas Subirat – who probably used the Random House edition which had the obviously wrong “world” mis-corrected to “word”, so that no slip was visible - has opted for interpreting both references as “word”. This avoids the word game of the original by repeating the word *palabra*. Valverde provides the most literal translation in the first part of the sentence by keeping “world” (*mundo*). However, he makes use of an ellipsis in the second section. As a result, there is no word game caused by a misprint but rather, a less clear reference by means of the repetition of *otro*. Moreover, the final section is even ambiguous due to the use of *eso otro* – which might refer to anything –, instead of *ese otro* that would clearly be associated to the antecedent “world”.

The translation of Tortosa has opted for *mudo* and *nombre* as components for a word game in which both “world” and “word” are implicitly suggested; “*mudo*” as misprint of *mundo*, and *nombre* an interpretation of “word”. However, the relationship between both concepts in Spanish is less clear than in the original, due to the lack of formal analogy between *mudo* and *nombre*.

Most translators have opted for a word per word equivalence. That occurs not only in Spanish, but also in French (*monde* and *mot*), in German (*Welt* and *Wort*), and in Italian (*mondo* and *parola*). This solution can be quite limited for translations of word games. An additional option would imply a transposition or, in other words, substituting a grammatical category by a different one. If one translates the two substantives by means of two verbs, the Spanish version could be “porque no me gusta lo que ratifica/amplifica. Por favor dime qué significa”. The problem with this translation would be how to keep the echo of the “world-word” word game in other episodes, such as “Hades”.

### ROMANIAN (Elena Păcurar)

Ți-am spus că ești un răutăcios pentru că expresia aialaltă nu-mi place. Te rog chiar să-mi explici ce înseamnă gluma asta. (Ro/I I 90)  
[I called you mean / nasty boy because I do not like that other expression. Please explain to me what that joke means.]

The Romanian translator has clearly opted for the *word-plays* of this passage and has omitted the confusion of *world/word*, which would not have had any special effect in Romanian anyway, since there is no (phonetic or semantic) similarity between *cuvânt* (*word*) and *lume* (*world*). Several other unfaithful translations slightly change the tone of the letter: the Romanian *răutăcios* (*mean, nasty* rather than the sexually allusive *naughty*) will later become *răule mic* (a sort of *you mean little thing*) or *răule mic drag* (*you mean little darling*), thus offering the readers a tamer, warmer, more affectionate version of the *naughtiness* implied here. As for the translations of *word*, Ivănescu chooses *expresia* (*the expression*) and *gluma* (*the joke*) – two equally censored

words for *the* (unmentionable) word. The fact that such a word would be read as a joke, a funny one, is illustrative of the prudish eye reading it – the eye of the Romanian reader under censorship: instead of producing a sexual innuendo, *the* word would mostly elicit laughter.

### DUTCH (Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes)

... omdat ik niet van dat andere wereld houd. (D/V 91)

... omdat ik niet houd van dat andere oord. (D/C&N 84)

... want ik hou niet van dat ondergrondelijke woord. (D/B&H 94)

There are certain details in *Ulysses* that can't be left ill-translated, or else you fall, as a translator, through the basket, as the Dutch saying goes, meaning your bunglements show you for who you really are, a non-valeur and worthless type of person, passing off as something you most definitely ain't.

But to put all the ambiguity in a box and leave it there sealed and never to be opened, like Vandenberg does, is the other extreme of hopelessness and throwing your hat in the ring, with towel, gloves, underwear and all. He translates *omdat ik niet van dat andere wereld houd* – which is an inconceivable writing or typing error in Dutch: no way that *wereld* can be mistaken for *woord*. Vandenberg must have thought Martha wrote “world” on purpose.

Claes & Nys in this instance were much better, coming up with *omdat ik niet houd van dat andere oord*. *Oord* is place but in Dutch a bit literary, except in placenames. However, because it is literary, it could refer well enough to the underworld, in a sense. And that is also one of the deeper layers of ore in Martha's mistake, and why Bloom remembers it so fondly.

To be finickingly *ad materiam*, what exactly would the word be that Martha doesn't like? If anyone could decide on that crux, we translators would be helped already more than a bit. “I called you naughty boy because I don't like that other wor[l]d.” What other word? Aeroplane? Queer Fish? Dirty old man? Sadomasochist in the *Psychopathia Sexualis* Sense of Richard von Krafft-Ebing? And if there is a “real meaning” to Martha – cf. the next sentence, “Please tell me what is the real meaning of that word?” -, is there also a non-real meaning to the mystery word? Does, in point of fact, “that other wor[l]d” refer to a synonym of “naughty” or “naughty boy”, or to a word Bloom uses and which she doesn't like, although she doesn't know its real meaning? How very feminine, even human! Before this question is decided, we can hardly be expected to deliver the one and only true and faithful translation.

We could, however, try to improve on *dat andere oord* and make it into *dat anderew oord*, in which the typing error is very clear, being the pressing of the spacebar a split second too late. Or, an even more cunning solution, change *andere* into *ondere*, that is: “nether”. “Because I do not like that nether word”.

We finally (but what is finally: there is always the fourth edition...) settled on *dat ondergrondelijke woord* – a mistake for *ondoorgegrondelijke woord*, unfathomable, a word she doesn't have the least inkling about, and in it is the Underworld, as Underground, *ondergrondelijk*. It is a beautiful mistake, perhaps too beautiful for Martha to make, but not for Bloom to see and remember. And

that is where the story goes: Bloom remembering Martha's darling error.

As to Martha's subsequent orthographical embranchments - "If you do not wrote", and "before my patience are exhausted" -, these should ideally be rendered just as plausibly as Molly's "It must have fell under the bed" that will be discussed later. Vandenberg translates: *als je niet schrijft*, but is exempted because the "wrote" was only emended by Gabler in 1984. But the plural verb to "patience" now escapes his attention, probably because it is a lonely one and not supported by the "wrote" mistake, resulting in a normal *voor mijn geduld uitgeput is*. Claes & Nys go for *als je niet schreeft*, adding a faulty end-t, used for the present tense, to the past tense, *schreef*, which is not an impossible solution. The "patience" bit they make into an error which is not impossible either, *voor ik mijn geduld op is*: a contamination of *voor ik mijn geduld verlies* and *voor mijn geduld op is* – expressions that are very close in meaning and frequency. Someone could start writing the first variant and distractedly end with the second, and come up with the contaminated result.

If *schreeft*, the past tense with a present tense ending, is possible as a mistake, then the obverse, the present tense with a past tense ending, is even more so, for in that case a letter has to be "forgotten" instead of accidentally added: *als jij me niet schrijf* is what it says in *Ulixes* now (D/B&H 94). For the second poser, we opted for a fairly ubiquitous error, the mixing up of the pronoun of the second person singular accusative and adverbial, *jou*, and the second person singular possessive pronoun, *jouw*. In this case, it gives a nice *double-entendre*, a moment of short-circuiting, as the word *verlies* can now be read as a verb (*ik verlies*, "I lose") and simultaneously as a noun (*jouw verlies*, "your loss"). And some tiny temporary friction in the reading faculty, some secret overtone, is what we aim at in translating Joyce.

### POLISH and RUSSIAN (Jolanta Wawrzycka)

Nazwałam cię niegrzecznym chłopczykiem , ponieważ nie lubię tego **słowa** nie z tego **świata**. Proszę, powiedz mi jakie jest prawdziwe znaczenie tego **słowa**. (P/S 60)

[I called you a naughty boy because I don't like that **word** not from this **world**. Please tell me what is the real meaning of that **word**.]

As is the case in many other languages, there is no lucky one-letter difference between *word/world* in Polish: *word* is *słowo*, *world* is *świat*. So what does the translator do? Słomczyński's solution is a clever one: he has the Polish Martha use *słowo* and *świat* in the first sentence to suggest that Bloom had used some puzzling *otherworldly* word that Martha, in the second sentence, asks to have explained. Given Bloom's predilection for "argol bargol" (12.1580), this is certainly a plausible possibility. However, any suggestion that Martha's spelling skills might be wanting is removed from Słomczyński's rendition of the letter which is orthographically correct, though it does preserve the original's tone and a-grammaticality of *patience* rendered in the plural to an equally funny effect.

A different dynamic is present in the Russian translation:

Я назвала тебя противным мальчишкой потому что мне совершенно не нравится тот свет. Пожалуйста, объясни мне, что этот твой совет означает? (R/H&H 61).

[I called you a contrary little-boy because I absolutely/utterly do not like this world. Please, explain to me what that counsel of yours means?]

By lucky draw, Russian **свет**, *world*, and **совет**, *counsel; advice*, differ by just one letter. The Russian Martha can, therefore, make a spelling mistake while typing: she would mean that she does not like that (word of) council (**совет**) and wants Bloom to explain that council or advice to her.

### HUNGARIAN (Erika Mihálycsa)

Haszontalan tacsónak mondtalak, mert nem szeretem azt a másik világot. Kérlek, írd meg, mi annak a szónak igazi értelme (H/G I 59)

[I called you a good-for-nothing cur, because I do not like that other world. Please write me what the real meaning of that word is.]

Rossz gyerekeknek neveztem magát, mert énnekem nem tetszik az a másik világ. Legyen szíves, mondja meg nekem, mi a pontos értelme annak a szónak. (H/Sz 93)

[I called you naughty child because I do not like that other world. Kindly tell me what the exact meaning of that word is.]

Rossz kisfiúnak neveztem Magát mert énnekem nem tetszik az a másik só. Legyen szíves mondja meg nekem mi a pontos értelme annak a szónak. (H/“C” 79)

[I called You naughty boy because I do not like that other salt. Kindly tell me what the exact meaning of that word is.]

Martha’s mistyping of “world” for “word” is one of the most important, multiply echoed lapses in the text; other languages are not as lucky as English, however, where this “portal of discovery” opens by the misplacing of one letter merely. The Hungarian *szó* [word] and *világ* [world] have not one letter in common; however, the first two translators deemed Martha’s error so telling that both retained “world”, even if nothing in the Hungarian text could justify its presence in a letter where presumably some slightly risqué “word” is meant. The allusion to the other, or netherworld [*másvilág*] is faintly perceptible – however, only Gáspár, the first translator more attentive to structural links, explores it in “Hades” where Martha’s wording is first echoed. Accordingly, he translates “There is another world after death named hell. I do not like that other world she wrote. No more do I” (6.1001) as “Van a halálon túl egy *másik világ*, pokol a neve. Nem szeretem azt a *másik világot*, azt írta. Én sem.” (H/G I 90, *my emphases*). Szentkuthy, whose flamboyant translation may at large be described as favouring the *word* to the *world*, the signifier to the signified, similarly retains *világ* [world] in Martha’s letter, at the risk of leaving it unjustified. However, he forgets the structural link by the next episode, so that his “Hades” curiously inverts the relation, retroactively re-inscribing “word” into Martha’s letter – and losing the associative link altogether: “A *másik világ*, az igenis a pokol. Én nem szeretem azt a *másik szót*, írta a nő. Én se” (H/Sz 140,



*my emphases*) [The other world, it is indeed hell. I do not like that *other word*, the woman wrote. Neither do I].

The “Corrected” Hungarian version, in contradistinction, set as its point of departure the possibility, and probability, of the error’s occurrence; according to the translator team’s rationale, tampering with the (presumable) intention of the letter-writing Martha in order to inscribe on her text a meaning that must be seen as secondary would inevitably damage the basic layer of narrative.<sup>1</sup> They therefore looked for a meaningful word that could result from the mistyping of the Hungarian for “word” [*szó*], leaving the sentence unaltered, and found it in *só* [salt]; in a next step, they tried to tune in all further structural echoes of Martha’s letter with this – plausible – typo. This resulted in a rewriting of the somber overtones of the “Hades” passage with its crucial connection of that “other world” to “hell”, based on a Hungarian idiom, “the salt of life” (meaning, something that gives life flavor – and by extrapolation, meaning -, thus with essentially positive connotations): “A halál után a *másvilág* jön, a *halál az élet sója*. Énnem nem tetszik az a *másik só*, azt írta. Nekem se” (H/“C” 114, *my emphases*) [After death the other world comes, death is the salt of life. I do not like that other salt, she wrote. Neither do I]. This darkly funny solution curiously short-circuits Bloom’s habit of making a mental *bricolage* of overheard phrases, hackneyed popular wisdom and clichés, with the eschatological Christian vision of life and of the world, as receiving its meaning and justification from the vanishing point of eternal life after physical death.

As regards the delicate issue of the shades of defective education that the English reader may surmise, neither of the earlier versions makes any attempt to signal ungrammaticality, and both have the letter punctuated according to the strict rules of Hungarian punctuation that, just like German, requires that sub-clauses be separated from the main clause by commas.<sup>2</sup> It is only the “Corrected” version that plants a (gross) mistake in her letter, in addition to the typo. In the place of the original’s erroneous plural in “before my patience are exhausted” we find, in Hungarian, “mert a türelmem elfogyik” (78) where the (superfluous) *-ik* ending of the verb is a veritable howler – distinguishing between verbs that take and those that do not take the *-ik* ending being one of the foolproof tests of a person’s (secondary, rather than higher) education and reading. In addition, her polite pining is thoroughly unpunctuated, just like Milly’s letter – a radical choice, as Hungarian has incomparably stricter rules of punctuation than English with its rather flexible and, to a great extent optional, commas (indeed, leaving out the odd comma here and there or putting them at the wrong place may have been an effective means of signalling Martha’s hazy education in Hungarian). This would likely strike the reader as a textual idiosyncrasy, not merely the display of defective writing skills.

One more memorable echo of this letter should be mentioned here, occasioning Joyce a smart play on pun/punish in “Sirens”: “How will you pun?”

<sup>1</sup> See András Kappanyos, “Joyce mint klasszikus auktör és mint magyar invenció”, *Alföld* 2010.9, 52-58.

<sup>2</sup> Curiously, it is the earliest translation that has Martha address the (unknown) Bloom on familiar terms with *te* (the equivalent of the French *tu*), whereas both later versions revert to the more formal *maga* (*vous*); the “Corrected” version even has her use the capitalized, slightly obsolete *Maga*, a mark of heightened politeness, and the wording suggests formal, slightly dated interwar to mid-twentieth-century Hungarian parlance.

You punish me?” (11.891). As for Szentkuthy’s Hungarian version, taken over by the “Corrected” text with a small change: “Hogy fog megb? Büntet engemet?” (H/Sz 347) [How will you *f.* (*me*)? (Are you) *punishing* me?] → “Hogy fog megb? Megbüntetni?” (H/“C” 272) [How will you *f.* (*me*)? Punish (me)?], the coded linguistic ellipsis evokes the very taboo-word for copulation [*basz-ni*], a monosyllabic b-word complete with the verbal prefix *meg-* that conveys aspect (perfect). This is consistent with Szentkuthy’s practice of lowering register and enhancing the Gargantuan humour and exuberant salaciousness of a famously scandalous text. Part of the textual game in soliciting the reader’s filling in the four-letter word in the proffered gap is, to play the expected association innocently down in the next sentence, with a wink at the reader: *honi soit qui mal y pense*.

## 2. Plasto’s high grade ha. (4.69)

The main task here is probably to project that one letter (or several) is erased. The predicament is magnified in another case of erasure, when “POST NO BILLS” is transmuted to “POST IIO PILLS” by two clever graphic deletions (8.101). All translations inspected have to go to literally greater lengths to devise meaningful results by letter substitutions.

To go beyond erasure *as* erasure, what’s in a specific “t”? One effect of change in translation (translation *is* change) is the possible lateral loss of those perhaps insignificant, psychological, non-existent, yet potentially amusing grace-notes that are so typical in Joyce. Minutes after Bloom fleetingly remarks that the letter “t” has been taken off from his high grade hat he remembers Simon Dedalus imitating Larry O’Rourke: he “takes him off to a tee with his eyes screwed up” (4.115). In *Ulysses* “t”s and “l”s can be screwed up, and don’t get started on “t”, “tee” and “tea”...

A kind of indeterminacy may be at stake here: whereas the most plausible interpretation remains Bloom’s reading of an (incomplete, worn-off) commercial label, a truncated “hat”, other readings are possible. The analogy of “Ba”, in “Nausicaa” (13.1117–43), suggests itself. This might refer to the bat Bloom has noticed, shortened for whatever reason, or it could be a stifled exclamation. In this case translators go different ways, some shorten the word for “bat” (often a very long one), others opt for “Ba” as mere sound.

## GERMAN, FRENCH (Fritz Senn)

Plastos allerbeste Mark. (G/G67)

Plastos prima Qualitäts-Hu. (G/W 79)

There is no problem in German, a terminal “t” can easily be effaced by sudatory attrition. The same is true of a final *-e* (for some reason “Marke” [brand] is truncated). Where the corresponding word for “hat” is longer, more surgery has to be applied – or the sweat has to put in much more of an effort (as with the Italian “cappello”) – or else the interior of the word has to be affected

(“cha aux” below). Or, as in “Marke”, another word can be gnawed at (as in Spanish: “calidad” ... “ca”).

Plasto i migliori capp . (I/DA 79)

Plasto, sombreros de gran ca. (S/T 63)

Plasto, chap de luxe. (F/M 57)

Plasto, les meilleurs cha aux. (F/A 75)

### ITALIAN (Enrico Terrinoni)

Ba. (13.1117, 1143)

Ba. (I/T 373)

Pip. (I/DA 517)

My predecessor reproduced mechanically the dropping of the final syllables of the word (which he thought was) in question: “bat” = “pipistrello” – “ba” = “pip”. The result has indeed Dickensian echoes. Here, besides the obvious reference to the uncanny animal, I also spot a very obscure and latent allusion to something else. My translation apparently does not change the original, and so it doesn’t look like a translation at all, if we take Joyce to mean solely a reference to the bat. Instead, I believe that, given the general allusiveness of the passage, and more pointedly the following reference to metempsychosis – something which Herodotus thought had come to Greece from Egypt – there is room for a secret explanation of the word Ba. In ancient Egypt Ba was in fact called the spiritual and divine part of a person’s soul. According to Egyptian iconography, Ba is sometimes represented as a bird with a human head, hence the connection with the bat. Ba could increase its power according to the strength of the person’s character. Thus, after death, it was thought to be able to escape the corpse, and come back only after the person’s mummification. This risky interpretation of mine required of course a footnote.

### ROMANIAN (Elena Păcurar)

Plasto, categoria întâi, ha. (Ro/II 65)  
[Plasto, high grade / high class, ha.]

An excellent, probably erroneous translation by Ivănescu features the enthusiastic *ha*, an exclamation (even without an exclamation mark) upon the rediscovery of Plasto’s majestic work, which perfectly counterbalances the previously *muted* legend of the *hat* (*pălărie* in Romanian, thus sharing not even one letter in common with *ha*). Though muted by erasing its *t*, the *hat* is given voice again upon its epiphanic reading about.

**DUTCH (Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes)**

Plasto's luxe hoe. (D/V 67)

Plasto luxe hoe. (D/C&N 63)

Plasto's kwaliteitshoe. (D/B&H 69)

Q: where did our venerable Dutch colleagues get the *luxe* from? A: From the famous French hatter *Ulysse le Chapeau Fou*. In other words, here, as in many other instances, they translate the French Morel translation. They should have gone for the Spanish and German ones instead! The truncation is probably not in Bloom's reading or thinking, but on the worn label. So we can't escape the hoe for *hoed*. *Hoo* for the slightly more pompous *hoofddekse* would have been nice, though that would have meant the – improbable– wear and tear of a lot more letters. Sometimes you have to take reality into account, even as a translator.

**POLISH and RUSSIAN (Jolanta Wawrzycka)**

Plasto, najwyższej jakości kapelu. (P/S 44)  
[Plasto, the highest quality ha.]

“Ha” is commonly interpreted to be Bloom's partial reading of the label inside his hat, manufactured by John Plasto, Dublin hatter. The preceding sentence confirms that the “sweated legend in the crown of his hat told him mutely: Plasto's high grade ha.” In “Sirens” we encounter Bloom's thought, “Card in my high grade ha” (11. 876). In Polish, *hat* is *kapelusz* and Słomczyński omits the final *sz*, two letters that stand for a single *sh* sound (a solution present in a few other translations, including *-eau*, in Morel).

The Russian translation takes a different route: “Плестой, шляпы-лю.” (R/H&H 46). [Plestoy, hats-de lu]. *De lux* in Russian is **люкс**; the two missing letters, **-кс**, stand for the *x* sound; *hats de lux* is a successful rendition of *high grade*, given that, traditionally, French was the language of the Russian upper class and aristocracy. Interestingly, Plasto's name got Russianised, cleverly so. **Плестой**/Plestoy evokes a name that would come from the Russian verb, **плести**, *to weave* or *braid*, and in its second meaning, *to spin* (a tale) or *to utter* (nonsense). In this context, the name **Плестой** and his *de lu* merchandise could be seen as a tongue-in-cheek commentary on the Frenchifying air that his product is to convey, but from which *de lux* is missing.

Incidentally, the Russianisation of names appears to be limited to Plasto's name only. A cursory scan reveals all of the names to be preserved as English, and they are *transliterated* with a focus on their phonetic stratum to sound as close to English as possible. Some of the effects are quite interesting: for instance, the two letter *J. J.* in *J. J. Mollo* can only be rendered by using four letters, **Дж. Дж.** (**Д** = D and **ж** = zh; together they are pronounced as a short hard dzh, a sound present, of course, in Joyce's own name in Russian and in every *Joe* and *John* name throughout the text. The *-gi-* in the Italian name of *Maginni* (U 8.98) is also rendered using **-дж-** as **Маджини** (R/H&H 117).

**3. It must have fell down, she said. He felt here and there. *Voglio e non vorrei*. Wonder if she pronounces that right: *voglio*. Not in the bed. (4.326)**

Molly's slip of the tongue in "Calypso" raises several problems with respect to translation. The first issue is, how blatant an ungrammaticality are we to take the substitution of "fell" for the normative past participle "fallen". Is this a plausible mistake? What mistakes, of tense or whatever, can occur in such a colloquial context?

The error is embedded and echoed, even underlined, in "Eumaeus" (16.1473), thus should evidence the fact that Molly's "fell" strikes Bloom as a liberty taken with English grammar, that would probably not please the ears of Lindley Murray, the author of a popular prescriptive grammar:

... he then recollected the morning littered bed etcetera and the book about Ruby with met him pike hoses (*sic*) in it which must have fell down ... with apologies to Lindley Murray. (16.1472)

Apart from the ungrammaticality, the "must have fell" has a series of secondary overtones, which yet greatly contribute to the textual dynamics that makes *Ulysses* such a dense and plural text. The erroneous "fell" seems to find an immediate aural echo in "*felt* here and there", uneasily connecting Molly's slip with (Bloom's mental processing of) touch - although this shade of textual echoing may obviously be beyond translators' reach. More importantly, a possible reading of "fell" is as a somewhat symptomatic avoidance of the normative past participle "fallen" - a psychologically charged word used in proximity of the place of the *fall*, the marital bed where Molly has tucked away Blazes Boylan's letter announcing her of his visit, a detail that didn't escape Bloom. This reading seems to be corroborated by the psychological ambiguity of the cluster "*Voglio. Not in the bed*" that transfers psychological tension, unwillingness/resistance to a foreign language - and in the event gives birth to another error. Bloom misremembers the words of Zerlina's aria from Mozart's *Don Giovanni* (*Vorrei e non vorrei*), grafting onto the line of the maidservant on the verge of stooping to conquest, the lines of Leporello, *Non voglio più servir*. Some of the marginal implications in translating this passage are, therefore, rendering the (interlingual) indeterminacy, and conveying the sense of psychological tension at work.

**GERMAN, FRENCH (Fritz Senn)**

Ist sicher runtergefallen (G/G 75)

welcher heruntergefallen sein musste (G/G 669)

Es muß runtergefallt sein. (G/W 89, 821)

Goyert flaunts no misuse at all, the clipped "runtergefallen" for standard "*heruntergefallen*") is quite appropriate and not felt to be wrong. Wollschläger had to force a genuine mistake in the wrong ending ("*gefallt*" instead of "*-gefallen*") that no native speaker would ever make. A mistake has to occur

also because of its later reverberation (16.1473).

Il a peut-être tombé (F/M 630)  
...qui a tombé (579)

Il est dû tomber (F/A85)  
... qu'est dû tomber (970)

French has recourse to “est dû” or the wrong auxiliary (“a” for “est”), and the likelihood of such grammatical departures has to be judged by French native speakers. A mistake is indispensable, otherwise there would be no need to adduce the grammarian Lindley Murray (16.1473)

### ITALIAN (Enrico Terrinoni)

Avrà cascato. (I/T 89)

Dev'essere cascato per terra (I/DA 88)

Sometimes ambiguity is forced into the text through the reproduction of errors, mistakes, or grammar oddities. However, when Molly says “it must have fell down” instead of “it must have fallen down”, this can somehow be perceived as a common mistake, as any Google search will show. As a mistake it is an easy one to make, a little childish perhaps, pointing maybe at a somewhat shaky education, but certainly not at complete illiteracy. Now, grammar mistakes like that in Italian work the opposite way. They denote total illiteracy, and we always have to be careful in proposing totally non-grammatical sentences. While De Angelis does not seem to have attempted any solution, my choice for the reproduction of Molly’s mistake was a bit of a compromise: *avrà cascato*. In this, the actual mistake (the auxiliary “to have” instead of “to be” for the present perfect of an intransitive verb), is somehow mitigated by the colloquial choice for “to fall”, that is, *cascare* instead of the more formal *cadere*, the appropriate equivalent. In this way, I take into account the reader’s reaction, and work on effects rather than on a supposed literal adherence to the original. The effect is, I believe, that of a mild mistake. With cases like this a translator has to be very careful, because copyeditors and editors will do their best to correct his work and make it look acceptable. Just imagine the reaction of a translation editor or reviser in encountering such a blatantly mistaken string of text. He/she would probably take the translator to be illiterate, not Molly. And were the translator not allowed a final check, as it often happens on the translation market – with texts that have to be ready for consumption as quickly as possible, having fixed publication dates – we might end up with an editor correcting Molly Bloom. Such a horrible but possible future scenario sometimes tempted me, while I was at odds with my translation, to do my own corrections – which I never did by the way. One of them – and I must admit, I would have been very happy to do it – was to turn Molly’s final “yes” into a glorious “no”.

**SPANISH (Guillermo Sanz Gallego)**

Debe de haberse caído (S/S 93)  
 el cual debe de haber caído (S/S 601)

Se debe haber caído (S/V 116)  
 que debía haberse caído (S/V 558)

Me se habrá caído (S/T 71)  
 que me se habrá caído (S/T 743)

The main difference here is found between the most recent version, the one by Tortosa and the other two translations. Apart from other similarities, such as the preference for the verb *deber* to express probability, both Salas Subirat and Valverde have opted for sentences that are grammatically correct in Spanish. The Spanish reader without access to the original will miss Molly's error and, therefore, her characterisation will be slightly different in these versions. This is particularly dangerous, because one can understand that the translator was either unable to find inspiration to reproduce a similar error in Spanish, or unable to identify the formal mistake.

Tortosa has produced quite a similar error in a sentence with the same meaning, but he also portrayed Molly in the same way as in the original version. The mistake with the word order of the pronouns in Spanish is comparable to the confusion of the past participle in English. This syntactic mistake in Spanish is stereotypical of a certain social group that has common features with Joyce's Molly. Accordingly, the character and her grammar are masterly transferred in the version by Tortosa.

If the translator is expected to reproduce the connection found in the original between the erroneous "fell" and the immediate aural echo in "He *felt* here and there" – connecting Molly's slip with touch –, a choice will have to be made. One can either focus on the content – such as in the published version, *palpó aquí y allá* –, or on the form. Possible options for reproducing the echo could be *se meció aquí y allá* (to sway), *se metió aquí y allá (la mano en el bolsillo)* (to put the hand in the pocket), *se mesó (los cabellos) aquí y allá* (to tear his hair out or to stroke the hair while reflecting on something), or *se meneó aquí y allá* (to wiggle). Any of these options can be seen as a hint to emphasise that the translator's choice of *me se* is volitional, and that Bloom is subtly making fun of his wife's mistake.

**ROMANIAN (Elena Păcurar)**

– Trebuie c-a căzut pe jos, spuse ea.  
 Pipăi încolo și încoace. Voglio e non vorrei. Mă întreb dacă ea-l pronunță cum trebuie: voglio. (Ro/I I 74)  
 [–It must have fallen down, she said. / He felt/touched there and here. Voglio e non vorrei. I wonder if she pronounces that right: voglio.]

As there is no difference between a past and a participle form in Romanian, no mistake can be made here. However, a hint as to Molly's deviation from the linguistic norm is illustrated by the translator's use of a cacophony: *c-a*

*căzut*, whose phonetic production is less than complimentary to a grammatically sensitive ear.

### DUTCH (Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes)

– Zal wel gevallen zijn, zei ze.  
Hij voelde hier en daar. (D/V 75)

– Misschien is het op de grond terechtgekomen, zei ze.  
Hij tastte hier en daar. (D/C&N 70)  
– Legt ie misschien onder het bed? vroeg ze.  
Hij voelde ernaar. (D/B&H 77):

Molly is “never vulgar”, Joyce famously warned his translators, somewhere, somewhen, in a quote we can’t lay our hands on at the moment. She may be uneducated, and make mistakes that she should have been taught not to make at school, but no vulgarity, that is coarseness that is unwarranted by the situation, passes her lips. Translators as a rule flatten out all kinds of dialect, and non-standard language. Mostly because they are too hard put to find equivalents. Vandenberghe prefers not to notice anything strange in “It must have fell down.” Claes & Nys completely hit the plank amiss and make Molly a very coarse and vulgarly speaking fishwife, with their reduplication of the *m* in *terechtgekomen* instead of *terechtgekomen*. Nowhere in her later talking or interior monologuing moments is this coarseness picked up again: in the rest of *Ulysses* she suddenly speaks very decent Dutch without such uneducated flaws.

A less conspicuous impediment of speech would be to have Molly say *leggen* instead of *liggen*, “lay” for “lie”, as millions do in Holland: *Legt ie misschien onder het bed?* And this is so small a difference, almost imperceptible, that it can easily be repeated in Molly’s monologue as well. An extra commendation for this translation is that *liggen en leggen*, lay and lie, carry the same horizontal and faintly coital connotations as the words “fall” and “fell” are remindful of the fall into sin.

The idea that the word “fell” gives rise to the sentence “Bloom *felt* here and there” would be attributable to the writer, and not to Bloom, who isn’t the writer after all, and doesn’t register in his mind “I felt here and there” or something like that. So the word “felt” does not belong to Bloom’s reality, though the act of feeling does. It would be nice to keep the echo, but not to the detriment of one of the most important features of *Ulysses*, and indeed of all of Joyce’s writing, his incredible ear for spoken language. Molly’s words come first, and *Legt ie misschien onder het bed* is *la phrase juste* here, and we’ll have to take it from there.

### HUNGARIAN (Erika Mihálycsa)

Biztosan leesett – mondotta.  
Tapogatott itt meg ott. Voglio e non vorrei. Vajon jól mondja-e ki majd a nő azt, hogy voglio? Nincs az ágyban. (H-G/ I 48)



-Úgy látszik, leesett – mondta Molly.

Tapogatta itt, kereste ott. Voglio e non vorrei. Fogadok, nem tudja helyesen kejtteni: voglio. Az ágyban nincs. (H-Sz/ 76)

-Nézd meg, nem-e leesett – mondta Molly.

Tapogatott ide-oda. Voglio e non vorrei. Kíváncsi vagyok, jól ejti-e ki: voglio. Az ágyban nincs. (H-“C”/ 65)

Of the three Hungarian versions, only the 2012 “Corrected” version looks for a solution to render Molly’s slip: “nem-e leesett” is erroneous, non-standard usage, as the question tag *-e* should be attached to the verb (correctly: *leesett-e*), never to the word of negation (*nem*). Such misplacing of the question tag, besides being relatively frequent in spoken Hungarian, is also prevalent in some regional varieties of the language – mainly, in Transylvanian Hungarian. Sanctioned by linguistic norm, it would nevertheless not qualify for as gross a mistake and mark of inferior education as the one made by Martha – in writing at that – in the “Corrected” letter, although it would certainly draw more than a raised eyebrow from grammarian Lindley Murray.

Molly’s memorable slip is also important because it is part of a dense cluster with multiple reverberations. Most of these depend on linguistic chance amounting to near-paronymy (such as the closeness of “fell” to “felt”), that cannot conceivably be approximated in Hungarian (where the verb chosen for “felt” in all three translations, “tapogat”, has marked sexual overtones – to the point that Szentkuthy’s version potentially misleads the reader to imagine, for an instant, that the – implied – object of Bloom’s pawing is Molly rather than the vague space around and under the bed). Similarly, there is no syntactic possibility to render the multi-layer resonance of the cluster, “*voglio. Not in the bed*”, a crucial secondary meaning – Bloom’s unwillingness to conceive of the marital bed as the site of adultery, signalled by his unacknowledged slip, transforming the Italian wording of Zerlina’s aria from the optative into the affirmative – being entirely lost: the Hungarian negative verb form of “to be”, *nincs*, already encodes the (implied) subject’s number and person, which in this case is clearly the fallen book, whereas the secondary meaning would require the use of the word of negation, “az ágyban **ne(m)** [akarom]” [in the bed (I do) not (want it)]. To complicate matters further, only the *ne* form of the negative encodes the imperative/optative. (A possibility for salvaging this in Hungarian would require tampering with the original and cutting Bloom’s cryptic sentence into two, as follows: “*voglio. Az ágyban nem. Találok*” [voglio. In the bed not. (I) find (it).])

#### 4.

In “Proteus” Stephen Dedalus recollects the blue French telegram, a “curiosity to show” that summoned him home from his self-willed Parisian exile, informing him about his mother’s imminent death:

**“Nother dying come home father” (3.199).**

The error that lends the telegram an air of “curiosity” relies on a likely substitution of the wrong letter in Morse code (the code for the letter *m* being — —, while that of *n*, — •). Thus it again forces translation texts to stay within the bounds of probability. At the same time the error functions as a veritable “portal of discovery” – amply underlined by the critical attention it has received. “No-ther” opens up multiple directions of reading – an-other, no-mother, no-other, not-her, just to list a few; it thus fortuitously engages the critical “other” (*Lui, c’est moi* being the subtext of much of “Proteus”) and foreshadows the word-ing strategies of the *Wake*. How can translation texts attempt to play the game?

Earlier translators did not deal with a lexical departure for the erroneous wording was only restored in Gabler’s *Ulysses* of 1984. So any straightforward “Mother” was not a conscious decision or correction.

The “Nother” mistake lends itself well to address the question of *What Exactly* has to be translated, and in what order of priority? In this case we primarily deal with an almost mechanical telegramme change. Would any plausible one-letter change be enough? Does it *have* to be from M (in languages where this is actually the requisite initial) to N? Is the emerging “other” (or “not her”) significant enough to move centre stage?

### GERMAN (Fritz Senn)

Nutter im sterben sofort nach hause vater. (G/W 60)

That “Mother” mutates to “Nother” is serendipitous in English by unleashing “Other” (with tremendous critical repercussions which were not yet in fashion at the writing of *Ulysses*). Since a letter substitution is necessary (and the one from M to N is plausible for a telegram), the result may become near meaningless or misleading, as it is with the German “Nutter”, since “Nutte” means prostitute, a gratuitous addition which could give rise to all sorts of archetypal free-wheeling.

### DUTCH (Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes)

Moeder stervend overkomst gewenst vader. (D/V 52)

Noeder stervend kom terug vader. (D/C&N 48)

Na op sterven kom naar huis pa. (D/B&H 52)

Brevity is the soul of a telegram and in this respect Vandenberg’s translation appears a bit too long: *Moeder stervend overkomst gewenst vader*. We certainly can’t ignore Gabler’s restoration.<sup>3</sup> You can choose the easy way

---

<sup>3</sup> On the other hand: Joyce didn’t “correct” Morel’s translation: *Mère mourante, reviens, père* (F/M 46). It is possible, of course, that he lost interest: when Ludmila Savitzky was translating *A Portrait* into French, Joyce was less than cooperative. Questions he answered with: “I don’t know what I wanted to say with that phrase. Just put something there.” And he suggested that she translate all the characters’ first names, Etienne Dedalus, Jean Lawton... “And Jacques Joyce then as well?” the translatrix asked. “*Mais bien sûr, pourquoi pas?*” (see Ludmila Savitzky’s In-

out and stay on the level of the simple telegrammatical typing error, as Claes and Nys predictably did: *Noeder stervend kom terug vader* (D/C&N 48). Yet in the back of our heads there is always something agenbiting: can't we do something with this? Can't we find something that looks like a telegraphic error, with an identical m/n-switch, but which maybe could have something more to say, some extra layer of meaning (*vulgo* joke), this Claes & Nys's *noeder* not allowing any other reading whatsoever? *Noeder* would not have been a "curiosity to show", as Stephen reminisces. That's probably why Claes & Nys translated this erroneously with *een bezienswaardigheid*, a sight to see, like a kind of tourist attraction, instead of something to *be shown*: *een curiositeit om te laten zien*.

And, staying real, making it more like a telegram, can't we shorten it a bit? The *stervend* in both translations is a very unhappy anglicism. When someone is dying, we say he/she *ligt op sterven*. And when someone or something (when used figuratively) is almost dead and gone, we say he, she or it is *op sterven na dood*, "dead except for dying". That gave us a possible clue: in the family a mother is sometimes called *ma*, so if that would have been used in the telegram, for brevity's sake, for instance, and if we fumbled a bit with the expressions for "dying", you could easily get *na*, which is also the word for "after". It's not exactly the same as the original (yes, we've been defeated again!), but at least *something* has been done with it. It's up to the readers to read something into it and with this translation they hopefully can. As Proust says: "Where the writer stops, the reader begins." We are curious to find what they'll come up with!

### SPANISH (Guillermo Sanz Gallego)

Mamá se muere ven a casa papá (S/Sub 74)

Mamá muriéndose vuelve casa padre (S/V 98)

Nadre muere vuelve casa padre. (S/T 49)

The two first translations into Spanish did not know of and so have not included any mistake in the transcription of the telegram, and both make use of the expression *mamá*. This term has different connotations than the one suggested in the original version, because *mamá* is less formal and less distant than *madre*. The aspect can be crucial in further textual analysis, provided that the original version includes a reference to "father" at the end of the sentence. The use of *mamá* and *padre* in Valverde's translation implies that Stephen's relationship with his mother was closer than with his father, a detail which is not explicitly expressed in the original text. Salas Subirat has opted for *mamá* and *papá*, which can be understood as a shift in Stephen's characterisation in Spanish. The protagonist appears more attached to his family than in the original version in English.

---

roduction to James Joyce, *Dedalus, Portrait de l'artiste jeune par lui-même*. Traduit de l'anglais par Ludmila Savitzky [1924]. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1943, p. 13). It is equally possible that he thought it was impossible to translate this *coquille voulue* and preserve the possible readings of "nother" ("another", "not her").

Tortosa has been able to maintain the mistake or misprint of the telegram with comparable interpretations. Like the original, *nadre* can be easily understood as a wrong spelling of *madre*. At the same time, alternative interpretations of “nother” such as “not her” can be traced in the Spanish version, because it can also be understood as a misspelling of *nadie* (nobody). One could also accept other versions, such as “*namá*”, which echoes *mamá* and could easily be linked with *nada más* (nothing more, no more, nothing else...). Yet, the solution provided by Tortosa seems to be the most faithful one to the original.

### POLISH and RUSSIAN (Jolanta Wawrzycka)

“Matka umierająca wracaj do domu ojciec” (P/S 35)  
[Mother dying return home father]

Whereas some translations took up Joyce’s plausible telegraph error, the Polish translation smoothed it out. As is the case in a few other translations, the initial *m* in *matka* could have been replaced with *n*. However, Słomczyński could not use *natka* because it is an existing Polish word: *natka*, diminutive of *nać*, refers to the leaves of root vegetables (especially parsley). Now, “Nother” has received lots of critical attention due to its openness to various readings, from “no-mother/no-other” to “not-her,” but this particular word game cannot be rendered in the Polish translation without a departure from the original: “mother” could metamorphose to a made-up nickname-like word, “*mamina*” or “*maminna*,” (“-inna” = “other”) but it is a matter of speculation whether the Polish reader would readily see any intentional word play in this defamiliarizing rendition of “mother” (not to mention the fact that such a rendition already narrows the range of the original’s “nother” and it would not really highlight the original’s one letter error). Incidentally, English language critical discussions of “Nother/Mother” would be very difficult to translate into Polish without extensive footnoting.

Russian translators, too, forego play on letters and offer a straightforward

Мать умирает возвращайся отец (R/H&H 36)  
[Mother is dying return father].

### HUNGARIAN (Erika Mihálycsa)

Mama halálán gyere haza apád. (H/G I 33)  
[Mama about to die come home father.]

Anya haldoklik gyere haza apa. (H/Sz 53)  
[Mother dying come home father.]

Ama haldoklik gyere haza apa. (H/“C” 45)  
[That dying come home father.]

In Hungarian the word for mother is “anya”: the palatalized double consonant in the middle cannot be plausibly mis-morsed by the change of one

letter only, in such a way as to yield a meaningful word, and one that would have the appropriate connotations at that. Therefore the translator team of the “Corrected” version faced a dilemma: whether to leave the textual locus unmarked (as in the two previous, pre-Gabler translations), throwing up their hands in despair and leaving the reader one near-Wakean epiphanic moment the poorer and contemplating the telegram’s description – “a curiosity to show” – somewhat superciliously, as nothing in the Hungarian text would strike the reader as odd – or to push the limits of probability for once and prioritize (secondary) meanings, language effects. At the May 2010 Zurich workshop lengthy discussions and debates took place with the two participating members of the team, Marianna Gula and András Kappanyos, on the margin of “nother”; it is then perhaps a bit due to the impact of this five-day polyglot re-joycing that the solution eventually adopted in the final, 2012 text emerged. “Ama” is an obsolete demonstrative pronoun, meaning “that”, thus implying an *other*, placed at a distance from the speaker; the substitution of this alienating demonstrative for the mother, if somewhat risky as it would require a telegraphist’s tampering with two letter codes instead of one (or the leaving out the first letter or “mama” in the – touching – case that Simon Dedalus and his son should refer with this term to the dying mother), chimes in singularly with the estranging overtones of the nonce word in the original. It so happens that this misrepresentation of the (dead) mother also reads as the root of the Latin verb “to love” – creating a further semantic knot with the key word “known to all men”, that Stephen engages with throughout *Ulysses*. And, if one may fetch even further – on the assumption that, as Fritz Senn says in the interview published in this issue, some of us are constitutional far-fetchers, and some, I would add, have been educated by the Joycean text to become such – this solution would displace (*translate*: transport) the *loving* overtones of another epiphanic moment in *Ulysses*, Bloom’s unfinished, aborted, wiped-out and therefore radically open and indefinite, self-description, written in the sand on Sandymount beach towards the end of “Nausicaa” (“I. AM. A”, 13.1264), where that selfsame root can be discerned.<sup>4</sup>

## 5.

The substitution – “tendon/tender” – in the example below relies on the near-homophony of the two words. Ironically, it is the anatomical clarification (“the tendon referred to”) that leads to the incongruent epithet for the epic hero who was known for his ruthless violence (though one might conceivably call to mind the one tender relationship Achilles had with Patroklos). As not rare in Eumaeus, “classical idiom” has gone awry. In Joyce’s variant the word “tendon” itself has become vulnerable:

The Boers were the beginning of the end. Brummagem England was toppling already and her downfall would be Ireland, her **Achilles heel**, which he explained to them about **the vulnerable**

---

<sup>4</sup> As pointed out by Fritz Senn, “Nausicaa”, in *Joyce’s Dislocations: Essays on Reading as Translation*, ed. John Paul Riquelme (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 160-98.

**point of Achilles**, the Greek hero, a point his auditors at once seized as he completely gripped their attention by showing the **tendon** referred to on his boot. (16.1003)

...the most vulnerable point too of **tender Achilles**. (16.1640)

So saying he skipped around,... to get on his companion's right a habit of, his right side being, in classical idiom, his **tender Achilles**. (16.1716)

### GERMAN(ic) and Romance languages (Fritz Senn)

In French the change from the identical words poses no problems:

... son talon d'Achille...à propos du point vulnérable d'Achille, ... en montrant le dit tendon sur sa chaussure (F/A 951)

Le point hautement vulnérable aussi du tendre Achille (977)

le côté droit étant ... son tendre Achille (979)

The earlier translation did not try to preserve the lexical transition but stuck to “tendon”:

... son talon d'Achille ... le point vulnérable d'Achille ... la place dudit tendon (F/M 565)

le point le plus vulnérable de ce tendon d'Achille (584)

son tendon d'Achille (586)

Goyert also did not seem to show a misunderstanding by simply sticking to “Achillesferse”. No reader would suspect anything gone wrong.

...Achillesferse ...die verwundbare Stelle des Achilles (G/ G 644)

die verwundbare Stelle dieses Achilles (665)

seine rechte Seite wäre ... seine Achillesferse (667)

Wollschläger signalled some oddity by moving from „seine Achillesferse ... als die verwundbarste Stelle des Achilles ... Sehne“ to „die verwundbarste Stelle des *sehnigen* Achilles“, and then serving up a conspicuous twisted compound, „seine *Sehnesachille*“ (G/W 801, 829, 852)

### ITALIAN (Enrico Terrinoni)

Era inoltre il punto più vulnerabile del molle Achille (I/T 630)

il punto più vulnerabile del tenero Achille (I/DA 874)

What can you do here?—I just went for literal translation for I couldn't find any good pun playing on the Italian words *tallone*, and *tenero* or *molle* or *soffice*, the latter three meaning roughly “tender”. Sometimes, when translation cannot be a proper rendering, it becomes a surrendering. But in the act of surrender, one creates new worlds. In this case, by describing Achilles as *molle* I am perhaps showing in a way a very unexpected aspect of his character. My translation, I hope, automatically makes one think both of the only actual “tender” point of his body referred to by the previous part of the sentence, and a rather curious tenderness of his soul. The word I chose, though, is not *tenero*, as De Angelis did, but *molle*, an adjective normally used in reference to one's character, and precisely one's lack of willingness or courage to act, which I find quite comical as far as the description of Achilles is concerned. Besides, it creates a nice sound effect. On the other hand, *tenero* is more of an adjective we would use when talking about a baby. Curiously enough, we use *tenero* also in connection with food, especially meat or chicken. The idea that Achilles is something of a tender chicken is a good one. Fair play to De Angelis.

### DUTCH (Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes)

De boeren waren het begin van het einde. Het namaak-Engeland wankelde reeds en zijn ineenstorting zou Ierland zijn, zijn Achilleshiel, de Griekse held—een punt dat zijn gehoor direct vatte zoals hij compleet hun aandacht vatte door op zijn schoen de betrokken pees te laten zien. (D/V 707)

De boeren waren het begin van het einde. Het protserige Engeland wankelde al en het zou definitief ten val worden gebracht door Ierland, zijn achilleshiel, waarbij hij uitleg verschaftte over dat kwetsbare punt van de Griekse held Achilles, een punt dat zijn toehoorders onmiddellijk duidelijk werd, toen hij om hun volledige aandacht te krijgen op zijn schoen de betrokken pees aanwees. (D/C&N 670)

Het klatergouden Engeland wankelde reeds en haar ondergang zou Ierland zijn, haar Achilleshiel, hetgeen hij hun nader verklaarde over het kwetsbare punt van Achilles, de Griekse held, een punt dat zijn toehoorders onmiddellijk vatten toen hij hun aandacht volledig vatte door de pees in kwestie aan te wijzen op zijn schoen. (D/B&H 727)

“Eumaeus” is a veritable catalogue of erroneous English, and it is sometimes maintained that this is the way Bloom would have written, if he had been able to write – or hadn't been able to write, depending on the appreciation assigned to the chapter. “Eumaeus” is Bloom's Matcham's Masterstroke. It abounds in contaminations of all sorts, mixed metaphors, malapropisms, misplaced modifiers, equivocations, dangling participles, anakolouthons, pleonasm, oxymorons, solecisms and plain wrong usages, to name but a few. Precisely little research, however, has been done into the stylistic motor, so to speak, which makes one error give rise to the next, in a concatenation of fallacies. That particular device we see at work in the “Achilles heel” passage. The writer, in this case of course very consciously, stumbles from one word he pretends not to recall to the next word which he misuses because he remembers the word he was looking for earlier, only a little too late, and uses them both, one mistaken word giving rise to the next, linked by a resemblance in sound or

meaning. We may call it the “all-stick-together”, in Dutch *zwaan-kleef-aan*, after the fairy tale. In this fragment it is easy to see that the first “point” brings on the second “point”, that the heel gives rise to the tendon, prepared by the sound-similar “attention”, and that “seized” immediately seizes on its synonym “gripped”.<sup>5</sup>

But, to faithfully maintain the “all-stick-together” words in translation, is another matter. You can use homonyms or sound-alikes, and generally everything that would stick out as badly said would be a boon and a bonus. The important thing is, if you are a translator and feel the urge to reject a word because of its ill-appropriateness, or homonymicity: don’t!

In the Achilles heel passage, we solved the problem by using the word *vatten* twice, in different meanings. The tendon is *pees* in Dutch, and *pezig* means sinewy, wiry, tough - not the same as tender, admittedly, but good enough to play around with in the game of All-stick-together: *Het klatergouden Engeland wankelde reeds en haar ondergang zou Ierland zijn, haar Achilleshiel, hetgeen hij hun nader verklaarde over het kwetsbare punt van Achilles, de Griekse held, een punt dat zijn toehoorders onmiddellijk vatten toen hij hun aandacht volledig vatte door de pees in kwestie aan te wijzen op zijn schoen* (D/B&H 727).

Our predecessors Claes & Nys, maintaining that bad Dutch wouldn’t work in a Dutchified “Eumaeus”, never did anything with the stylistic malware, and don’t count. Vandenbergh in 1969 would have done something, if he had noticed, but more often than not the fumlings escaped his attention. Which is a pity, in both cases, because “Eumaeus” is the cherry on the cake for every translator: you are free, even obliged to do everything in your language that from your schooldays and mother’s knees on you weren’t allowed to do, with impunity! scot-free! and be praised for it!

### POLISH and RUSSIAN (Jolanta Wawrzycka)

Boerzy byli początkiem końca. Dwulicowa Anglia chwiała się już, a runie dzięki Irlandii, swej pięcie Achillesowej, poczym wyjaśnił to, opowiedziawszy im o czułym miejscu Achillesa, bohatera greckiego – słuchacze jego pojęli

---

<sup>5</sup> The inventrix of this method of writing is Amanda Ros, also dubbed, with glorious justification, “the world’s best bad writer”, being, with James Joyce, the world’s best good writer, a favourite of Fritz Senn’s, and not only his. In her 1899 masterpiece *Irene Iddesleigh* Amanda Ros manages to out-Eumaeus “Eumaeus” but, and this makes her unique, totally unconsciously, without the slightest trace of irony. All manners of beautiful writing find their blossoming bloom in *Irene Iddesleigh*. Opening the book at random on page 47, one gets sentences like this, about Lord Dunfern: “Often would he be found half asleep in deep thought, not having any friend of immediate intimacy, in whom he could confide or trust, or to whom he could unbosom the conduct of his wife, whose actions now he was beginning to detest.” Half asleep *and* in deep thought, and obviously, or so it seems to say, *because* he did not have any friend, and not just a friend, no, one of immediate intimacy (alliterations are Mrs. Ros’ *forte*), moreover one in whom he could confide or trust: it is all very much much too much of the good. But you see how the words intoxicate the writer and magnetically pull other words from their haunt. In the next paragraph, we read about cherished hopes “which unmistakably were crushed to atoms beneath the feet of her who was the sole instigation of their origin”: “feet” brings “soles” to the writer’s mind, and out of confusion about the many words for “cause” she salvages two: “instigation” and “origin”.



rzecz natychmiast, gdyż całkowicie przykuł ich uwagę, ukazując omawiane ścięgno na swoim bucie. (P/S 445).

[The Boers were the beginning of the end. The two-faced England was toppling already and it will fall thanks to Ireland, its Achilles heel, and then he explained it by telling them about the tender spot of Achilles, the Greek hero – his listeners understood immediately because he arrested their attention by showing them the tendon under discussion on his boot]

**the most vulnerable point too of tender Achilles.** (16.1640)

...najczulszy punkt tego ścięgna Achillesowego... (P/S 459)

[...the most tender point of that Achilles tendon...]

Mówiąc to, obszedł go zręcznie, ... zamierzając ... znaleźć się po prawej stronie swego towarzysza, ... to był jego nawyk, to znajdowanie się po prawej stronie, a według klasycznego idiomu: jego ścięgno Achillesowe. (P/S 461)

The near-coincidence of sound in the words “tender”/”tendon” allows Joyce to exploit the two words by creating the funny “tender Achilles,” a double-decker phrasing that connotes Achilles tendon and is a possible nod, as Senn has suggested, to Achilles’s relationship with Patroklos. No such luck in Polish: “tendon” is “ścięgno” and the polyvalent word “tender” has to be contextualized and rendered as an adjective, “czuły (-a)” (“most tender” = “najczulszy”). Thus lexical limitations make it impossible to render “tender Achilles” in Polish; it is normalized into Achilles’s “ścięgno” – “tendon.”

In general, Słomczyński’s translation of the sentences under consideration is very much in keeping with the original, to the extent that they are convoluted and cluttered with appropriate clichés. However, the muddled, run-away syntax/semantics is quite polished in Słomczyński’s translation.<sup>6</sup> As a result, the sentences read as correct – if a bit tedious – grammatical constructs, as my back translations indicate.

Now, in Russian, **Achilles heel** in reference to Ireland is translated unproblematically as **ахиллесова пята** (R/H&H 440), with the name of Achilles rendered as an adjectival attribute of *heel*. Similarly, *The vulnerable point of Achilles* of the Greek hero follows the original very closely as **уязвимое место Ахилла** [the vulnerable place of Achilles]; and finally, **the tendon** that Bloom shows **on his boot** is rendered as **сухожилие у себя на стопе** [tendon on his foot], with the corrective *foot* replacing Bloom’s *boot*.

The two instances of “tender Achilles” are presented in two different ways in Russian: *The most vulnerable point too of tender Achilles* is translated as a full sentence: **Это же было самым уязвимым местом и у нежного Ахилла** (R/H&H 454) [This was the most vulnerable place too of tender Achilles]. As back translation shows, this is a very successful solution because it uses the word *tender*, **нежный** (нежного above is a genitive case), which coincides to some extent (there is a two letters difference) with the word **ножной**, an adjectival form of *foot*. The two words, **нежный/ножной**, while by no means homophones, share a phonetic spectrum that *could* cause a listener mistake one

<sup>6</sup> One could envision editor’s intervention as the manuscript went into production, but that is a pure speculation on my part.

for the other, not unlike *tender/tendon*. But by the time Bloom skips over to Stephen's right side because his habit to do so is, in classical idiom, *his tender Achilles*, in Russian we are back to "Achilles heel" or его ахиллесовой пятой (R/H&H 455), rendered in ablative case.

## 6.

"Eumaeus" is perhaps the *Ulysses* episode to which the most critical misprisions held, for the longest time. The pervasive wrongness of Eumaeian stylistic fumbles was one of the areas we focussed on in our discussions at the Zurich translation workshop.

The sentence below is, we believe, a pertinent example of the manifold stylistic infelicities adorning the second-hand literariness of "Eumaeus" – as evidenced by the near-tautology of the phrase, "*synopsis of things in general*". We asked our contributors to concentrate on the conspicuous mislaid adjective "untastable" which most translation versions listed here "put to its rightful place", and to see how far it is possible to create a similarly *wrong or awkward* contrivance in translation.

**Over his untastable apology for a cup of coffee, listening to this synopsis of things in general, Stephen stared at nothing in particular. (16.1141)**

## GERMAN(ic) and Romance languages (Fritz Senn)

Certain oddities in Eumaeus appear less mismanaged when the syntactic and stylistic misfits are seen as a transposition of underlying inchoate jumbling thoughts —stylized interior monologue in a failed attempt to make it sound literary.

Beverages can be untastable, an apology less so, except by broad metaphoric license. What is at work here is a process: the coffee is untastable, so that one would have to apologize for it; this is conflated into an incongruous "untastable apology". The incongruity, in all likelihood well-nigh impossible to reproduce, gives way to much more logical, but far less comically jarring summaries. There is nothing outrageously absurd in paraphrases like: "über seinem ungeniessbaren Kaffee-Ersatz" (G/G 649), "su improbable sustitución de taza de café" (S/V I.274), "sur son ersatz inavalable de café" (F/A957), "du taza de lamentable proyecto de café intransitable (S/S 663), "sopra della tazza di imbevibile sostituto di caffè" (I/DA 570), "quell'imbevibile imitazione di tazza di caffè", (I/T 617), "bij zijn ongenietbare imitatie van een kop koffie" (D/N&C 674), "über dem ungenießbaren Gebräu, das eine Tasse Kaffee sein sollte" (G/W 807), etc. — they all lack, perhaps inevitably, that unique Eumaeian twist. Possibly, and this is for native speakers to decide, some literal imitation like "ungeniessbare Entschuldigung", "imbevibile scusa", "inavalable excuse" might have been risked, precisely because they are absurd.

über seinem ungenießbaren Kaffee-Ersatz (G/G 649)

Über dem ungenießbaren Gebräu, das eine Tasse Kaffee sein sollte (G/W 807)

Al di sopra della sua tazza di imbevibile sostituto di caffè (I/DA 834)

Su quell' **imbevibile scusa** per una tazza di caffè (I/F 495)

Frente a su tazza de lamentable proyeto du café intransitable (S/S 663)

Por encima de su improbable sustitución de taza de café (S/V II 274)

Mientras se tomba su imbebible pegote de taza de sucedáneo de café (S/T 649)

### FRENCH (Tim Conley)

Au-dessus de son très-peu-pour-moi-de-moka (F/M 569)

Penché sur son ersatz inavalable de café (F/A 800)

The French versions, like most others, leave out the erratic mismatched “apology” which fits in only in a Eumaeian roundabout way.

Aubert’s annotations to Morel’s translation (in Gallimard’s two-volume *Œuvres*) proposes: “son ersatz ingoûtable de tasse de café.” I like this formulation best of the three, for “inavalable” suggests “unswallowable,” which is an effective (and unwanted) correction of the original “untastable,” a puzzling description. It is more comprehensible to say that a coffee is so bad that one can’t *swallow* it than to say that one can’t *taste* it, and to make matters worse, as the syntax of “Eumaeus” has it, it is not strictly speaking the coffee that is being apologized for but the cup (plus there’s something suitably, amusingly genteel about “tasse de café” in this context). The epiphenomenological quandaries of Joyce’s multisensory mélange of a sentence culminate in the phrase “stared at nothing in particular” (“ne fixait rien en particulier” in Morel’s translation), which, like “apology for a cup” is a phrase whose oddity and abstraction might pass unnoticed. Stephen is listening to a vague something “over” the untastable and staring at nothing – if the White King admires Alice for being able to see nobody on the road, what must we poor readers think of Stephen’s ineluctable abilities!

### ROMANIAN (Elena Păcurar)

Pe deasupra aceluia de negustat simulacru al unei cești de cafea, ascultând acest sinopsis al lucrurilor în general, Stephen rămăsese cu ochii în gol. (Ro/I II 275)

[Over that untastable simulacrum of a cup of coffee, listening to this synopsis of things in general, Stephen stared at nothing in particular.]

The Romanian preference for *simulacrum* over *apology* helps induce a state of quasi-hypnosis in which Stephen engages himself, whereby the contours of reality and hallucination are blurred. A sense of detachment, of distantiation,

is hinted at by the replacement, in translation, of the possessive *his* with *that*; the choice of the stronger word *de negustat* (*untastable*) instead of the more common *fără gust* (*tasteless*) helps not only keep to the original note of the English fragment, but also emphasize the blank in Stephen's reception of words, treats.

### DUTCH (Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes)

Bij dat onsmakelijke goedje dat een kop koffie moest voorstellen ... (D/V 712)

... bij zijn ongenietbare imitatie van een kop koffie ... (D/C&N 674)

Boven zijn onsmakbaar slappe aftreksel van een bak leut, of wat daarvoor moest doorgaan ... (D/B&H 732)

One of the characteristics of the true Eumaeian style is laying it on thick, as if the message were not clear already. This is caused by a vague (and justified) distrust of the author's own writing skills, but also by a lack of faith in the capabilities of the reader. Which resembles the way in which Claes & Nys translated *Ulysses*. Their translation reads more like an explanation, as if that would be the primary goal of translating a notoriously difficult book. They do the thinking, making the nasty sharp bits palatable. They consider the reader to be a consumer, and so he just has to swallow it, with words and all. Probably because Claes & Nys somehow recognized their own *modus operandi*, they shuddered most from this chapter, which in the end they didn't think translatable at all. So they came up with their usual recipe: tone it all down. Their version reads: "... *bij zijn ongenietbare imitatie van een kop koffie ..*". (674). In back-translation: 'By his unenjoyable imitation of a cup of coffee...', which may be stupid, but it hardly uses the possibilities the Dutch language offers for eumaeification.

"Untastable" is not only a "misleading" adjective, it also tries to top that by exaggeration of the sense "tasteless", literally meaning something like "unable to give off any taste at all". This truly is the unspeakable in pursuit of the inedible.

Vandenbergh translates "untastable" as if it said "tasteless" and Claes & Nys exchange the strangeness of "untastable" for the equivalent of the *ungeniessbaren* they discovered in the German translations.

We first thought of *onsmakeloos*, a rather clumsy contamination of *onsmakelijk* and *smakeloos*, both meaning "tasteless", but in the contaminated form, two minuses making a plus, make up the opposite: tasty! But couldn't we do worse than that? Yes, *onmaakbaar* (in the ear at least connected to *onmaakbaar*, 'unmakable'), with the extra layer that it *can't* be tasted, even if you tried. The rest is, so to speak, plain sailing: *een slap aftreksel* is "a weak dilution", in other words, "a poor apology", stemming from the sphere of beverages, but now only used figuratively.

Our translation takes it back to the literal domain and to emphasize that, to lay it on thicker and thicker, we even explain it by *of wat daarvoor moest doorgaan* ("or what had to pass for it"). *Een bak leut* is civilized or rectified, and therefore wrong, Dutch for the colloquial *bakkie leut*. The diminutive

suffix *-ie* is thought of as a bit vulgar, but there are couple of words that are only used with it: *makkie* (a piece of cake), *broekie* (“rooky”) and the aforementioned *bakkie*. You can immediately tell when there is some bad writing going on as the author somehow tries to soften the blow of the colloquial language by adorning it with the proper *-je*: *makje*, *broekje*. Or, as our “Eumaeus” did, by skipping it altogether.

### POLISH and RUSSIAN (Jolanta Wawrzycka)

Ponad swą niesmaczną nędzną namiastką kawy słuchając tego zestawienia spraw ogólnych, Stefan wpatrywał się, lecz w nic określonego. (P/S 448)  
[Over his tasteless poor substitute/surrogate for coffee listening to the synopsis of things in general, Stephen was staring but at nothing in particular].

Joyce’s “untestable apology” for coffee becomes “tasteless substitute” in Polish, tautologically reinforced by *nędzna*, “poor.” The illogicality of the word *untastable* (anything can be put in one’s mouth to be tasted, really) is difficult to render in Polish using just one word. The translator would have resort to a phrase that deems Stephen’s coffee as “nie możliwa do smakowania” (impossible to be tasted). Of course, “untastable apology” adds another dimension to the waywardness of the phrasing and translators’ solutions cannot but be normative, as is the case in Słomczyński’s solution, “tasteless substitute for coffee.”

Russian translation departs a bit from the original: **Сидя над безвкусовой пародией на чашку кофе и слушая мудрые речи про пуп и нечто, Стивен, не шевелясь, глядел в пустоту** (R/H&H 443) [Sitting over a tasteless parody for a cup of coffee and listening to the smart speech about the navel and something, Stephen, motionless, stared into the void]. Translatorial/poetic licence is at play here when the translators rewrite Joyce’s *synopsis of things in general* into speech about some insignificant matters that Stephen is hearing. The sense of inconsequentiality of the talk around him is preserved well, however, though Joyce’s off kilter *untestable apology* is smoothed out into standard, normative language.

### 7.

**Mixed metaphors** are one of the favourite stylistic devices in Eumaeus, playing with the uneasy overlapping of figurative and literal meanings. Translation, in such instances, would probably have to engage whatever idioms, clichés the target language offers and make an attempt at creating a style that shows all the variety of Eumaeian incongruities, fumbles, errors, infelicities etc. – in other words, to *translude*. What has been/can be done in this particular case?

**Not, he parenthesised, that for the sake of filthy lucre he need necessarily embrace the lyric platform as a walk of life for any lengthy space of time. (16.1841)**

**GERMAN(ic) and Romance languages (Fritz Senn)**

Nicht, so parenthesierte er, sollte er etwa aus Gewinnsucht auf die Gesangsbühne und brauchte auch gar nicht lange drauf zu bleiben. (G/G 672)

There is nothing whatsoever strange or clashing here and the whole sentence is trivialised and tedious.

Nicht, schaltete er in Klammern ein, daß er nun unbedingt um schnöden Gewinstes willen die lyrische Bühne als Lebenslaufbahn für einen längeren Zeitraum ergreifen sollte. (G/W 837)

This tries to follow close and is moderately askew, but no vision of a platform being “embraced” is called up. *Lebenslaufbahn* cleverly turns *Laufbahn* (for “career“) into a track to run in.

Non pas, ceci était une parenthèse, qu’il dût nécessairement se vouer aux planches pour l’ignoble appât du gain, ni comme une manière de vivre pendant de longues années ... (F/M 590)

This has all the appearance of normal French. In contrast the newer, more alert translation of 2004 is capturing the near-surrealist effect:

Non, se dit-il entre parenthèses, que pour l’amour répugnant du lucre il dût nécessairement embrasser les planches lyriques comme carrière pour un durée excessive (F/A 985)

What happens in other languages would have to be left to native speakers who are able to taste errant nuances. In the Italian instance below a career is being embraced which sounds more in tune with usage than when the object is a lyric platform.

Non che, aggiunse a mo' di parentesi, per amor del vile metallo egli dovesse di necessità abbracciare la carriera di cantante cime modus vivendi per molti anni a venire (I/DA 862).

**DUTCH (Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes)**

Niet, zo overwoog hij tussen haakjes, dat hij nu per se om het vuige winstbejag het lyrisch podium als werkkring gedurende een bepaalde periode moest aangrijpen, ... (D/V 735)

Niet, tussen haakjes, dat hij zich verplicht hoefde te voelen om gedurende een lange periode voor het slijk der aarde een zangcarrière op het podium neer te zetten. (D/C&N 696)

Niet, onderbrak hij zichzelf, dat hij omwille van het slijk der aarde voor enige langere spanne tijds het lyrische podium moest en zou beklimmen bij wijze van loopbaan voor het leven. (D/B&H 756)

Eumean style is not only catching and contagious, it is even addictive

and soon becomes a habit that is hard to kick. Mixed metaphors are within everybody's reach, and every language can manufacture its own delicious incongruities - by misapplying standard expressions that, if taken literally, hit like a tongs on a pig, as the Dutch expression goes.

Vandenberg has, as a strange concoction, "to seize the stage" (735), which gives a nice image. Claes & Nys (696) mention "a singing career to be put on the stage" which, with some good will, can be read as a faulty literary attribution to a figurative expression. The "lengthy space of time," however, neither recreated into an incongruous space-time continuum: *gedurende een lange periode* (D/C&N) and *gedurende een bepaalde periode* (D/V) is just what is says. In [our] *Ulixes* it became *een langere spanne tijds* in which *spanne* usually applies to spaces, and the mixed metaphor comes out as the "climbing of the lyrical stage by way of career for life" (756).

### HUNGARIAN (Erika Mihálycsa)

Azért ne nyereszkedésből lépjen a pódiumra, jegyezte meg zárójelek között, és ne is maradjon ott soká... (H/G II 198)

[Still, he should not step on the platform for profiteering, he remarked in parenthesis, and should not stay there for long...]

Zárójelben hozzátette, hogy nem piszkos nyereszkedésért kell erőszakolnia a zenés színpadokat, nem is évek hosszú soráról van szó... (H/Sz 743)

[In parenthesis he added that not for filthy profiteering should he force (violate) the lyric stage, neither is it about long years to come...]

Na nem arról van szó, tette hozzá zárójelben, hogy a piszkos anyagiak végett huzamosabb időre kellene pályáivét a zenés színpadhoz cövekelnie. (H/"C" 563)

[It is not, he added in parenthesis, that he should for filthy lucre fasten ("stick/rod") the arc of his career to the lyric stage.]

The successive Hungarian translation versions show a growing awareness of, and sensitivity to, the Eumaeian style that thrives on incongruities, collusion, the infelicitous overlapping of literal and figurative meanings. The first translator, Endre Gáspár, working in the 1940s, quite evidently shied away from the humorous language effects of this episode; his bland rendering shows the hand of a translator who, against all evidence to the contrary, still tries to read "Eumaeus" as though it were some kind of more or less realistic plain sailing. No visible attempt is made to salvage either the collusion or the infelicitous collocation "space of time", only the "contents" of Bloom's remark being rendered; neither does Gáspár recognize the importance of received language, so his sentence (as his rendering of the episode at large) reads as if a pedantic proof-reader of the old school had rigorously crossed out the hackneyed phrases, and exterminated the tautologies, mixed metaphors and other varieties of stylistic fumbles that Joyce went to such pains to amass. The second translator, a flamboyant novelist in his own right, produced a rather uneven version of this episode, failing to register many Eumaeian subtleties – yet he did embrace the thesaurus of Hungarian clichés and his solutions occasionally show great side gains. His rendering of this sentence, although it uses merely one turn-of-

phrase that can be classified as a bland cliché [*évek hosszú sora*: “long line of years”], retains an appropriately clichéd tone; at the heart of the sentence we find a lovely instance of mixed metaphor, the original’s ticklingly erotic embracing of the lyric platform having become, by virtue of sliding signification, a rapist’s forcing himself upon the lyric stage. The “Corrected” version, that slips in the nearest and most worn-out – therefore most Eumaeian – Hungarian equivalent of “filthy lucre”, chose not to retain this macho touch, but supplied another language effect where literal and figurative readings jostle. The choice of Hungarian idiom, *(le)cövekel* [“to stick/rod down” meaning, to plant oneself in a spot, to take roots – also used with the meaning, to stick to somebody, a partner for life], and based on the verb, to drive a stick/rod [*cövek*] into the ground, is already erroneous here, since instead of the expected verbal prefix/post-position [*le*: “down”], the noun of the verbal phrase takes another post-position [*hoz(zá)*: “to sg/sy”] meaning, to stick/attach to sg/sy – and brings to mind mostly the practice of tying a tethered animal down to a stick or pole driven into the ground. This erroneous slip is topped by the full-fledged collusion of literal and figurative readings, of tying down the *arc of one’s career* (a tautological compound in its own right) to a (palpable, literal) stick. In contradistinction to Szentkuthy’s risqué solution that betrays a bit too much the translator’s voluntary and purposeful error, this sentence is thoroughly congruent with the (new) Hungarian “Eumaeus” and speaks of funny idiomatic slips caused by recurring linguistic automatism.

**8. The horse having reached the end of his tether, so to speak, halted and, rearing high a proud feathering tail, added his quota by letting fall on the floor which the brush would soon brush up and polish, three smoking globes of turds. (16.1874)**

The sentence listed here has been called “Joyce’s farewell to realism”, as it ends on the gravitational one-syllable “turds” that come down, strategically, at the end of the sentence. At a closer look it is also revealed that the narrative sequence has been tampered with: the “turds” are cleaned away before they have reached the ground. Many translation versions, partially constrained by target language syntactical structures, choose not to reproduce, or downright deflate, the original’s building up of narrative tension.

Eumaeian syntax is distinguished through the amassing of idioms and clichés, taken literally and figuratively at the same time. The focus here is on the idiomatic “end of his tether”. It is already a phrase repeated within the chapter: “there he was at the end of his tether” (16.952), where it, purely figuratively, refers to a person. A horse, however, might in fact be tethered, yet the one in question is definitely not, so that metaphor is, so to speak, dangling. On the whole, the sentence, mimicking the classical well-rounded period, mixes the would-be elevation of shop-soiled journalese, of second-hand “literariness”, with low register, one of the things at stake in translation here being, how *not* to euphemize “turds”.



### GERMAN (ic) and Romance languages (Fritz Senn)

There is no equivalent analogy in German. So Goyert originally followed suit, literally: “Als das Pferd sozusagen das Ende seines Spannseiles erreicht hatte” (G/G, first edition of 1927, III, 388), but then in revision it became more mechanical: “Als das Pferd sozusagen seine Rolle abgerollt hatte” (G/G 673); this was no doubt based on the French rendering of 1929: “Le cheval, étant parvenu pour ainsi dire *au bout de son rouleau*, s’immobilisa” (F/M 590.)

Wollschläger’s version has a charm of its own: “Das Pferd, welches sozusagen bis ans *Ende seiner Laufbahn gelangt* war, blieb stehen” (G/W 838); the horse has reached the end of its career (*Laufbahn*), and in this context “Laufbahn“ (literally the “course of its run“), already used in a former context, might very well describe a tether. The oddly embedded *Laufbahn* has a Eumaeian effect.

The newer French *Ulysse* moves in the same track: “Le cheval, étant pour ainsi dire au bout du rouleau, s’immobilisa” (F/A986).

Only one of the translations just quoted uses the same expression for the earlier occurrence: “voice arrivé au bout du rouleau” (F/A 949); the others vary according to context: “Et il était à quia sans un rotin” (F/M 564); Wollschläger uses a common metaphoric equivalent in German: “am Ende mit seinem Latein” (literally “the end of his Latin”, G/W 799). Goyert obviously misunderstood: “Und das wäre nun das Ende” (G/G 643). Yet one must not overlook that the use, consistently, of the same phrase wherever it occurs in a tightly woven network is more of an ideal than a practicality, since different contexts demand different solutions.

### SPANISH (Guillermo Sanz Gallego)

El caballo, habiendo llegado, por así decirlo, al final de su aguante, se detuvo y, levantando a guisa de señal una orgullosa cola movable, agregó lo suyo dejando caer al suelo, que el cepillo pronto repararía y lustraría, tres humeantes esferas de bosta. (S/S 612)

El caballo, habiendo llegado al punto de quemar su último cartucho, como quien dice, se detuvo y, levantando en alto una orgullosa cola empenachada, contribuyó con su cuota dejando caer en el suelo, que la barredora pronto cepillaría y limpiaría, tres humeantes esferas de boñigas. (S/V 567)

Estando el caballo ya en sus últimas, como quien dice, se paró y, levantando en alto una altanera cola emplumada, puso su granito de arena dejando caer al suelo lo que el barrendero pronto barrería y limpiaría, tres humeantes esferas de boñigas. (S/T 756)

All three translations into Spanish have maintained the Eumaeian syntax, in which the reader observes how the turds are brushed before touching the ground. The narrative tension is thus reproduced in all versions. Also, the gravitational “turds“ at the end of the passage appear in the same way in Spanish. The term has not been euphemised either. One notices a certain analogy in the final section, which is translated as *tres humeantes esferas de boñigas*, except

for Salas Subirat's version, in which the term "turds" has been translated by a similar option, *bosta*.

Yet, although all versions have maintained the Eumaeian syntax and the register of "turds", the effect is different. The initial part – "the horse having reached the end of his tether" – has been interpreted by the two most recent translations as an indication of the horse being extremely tired or even in the throes of death. Subirat has opted for *aguante* with a broader sense because, like the two other versions, it alludes to fatigue, but it can also be linked with the physiological action that is narrated at the end of the sentence.

### ROMANIAN (Elena Păcurar)

Calul ajuns la capătul răbdării, ca să spunem așa, se opri și ridicându-și sus de tot o coadă mândră stufoasă își aduse contribuția lăsând să cadă pe pavajul pe care mătura avea în curând să-l măture și să-l lustruiască, trei globuri fumegânde de reziduuri. (Ro/I II 301)

[The horse, having reached the end of his patience, so to speak, halted and rearing high a proud thick tail, brought his contribution by letting fall on the pavement which the brush would soon swipe and polish, three smoking globes of turds.]

The Romanian language has a partial similarity with the metaphoric *end of the tether: la capătul funiei* (*rope's end* – echoing more an unbearable state, reaching a state of exhaustion rather than running out of patience), which could have functioned instead of *the end of his patience*, where Ivănescu opted for the metaphor and not for the literal sense.

### DUTCH (Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes)

Het paard dat, om zo te zeggen, aan het eind van zijn tuier was, bleef staan en, een trotse pluimstaart hoog opheffend, droeg het zijn aandeel bij door datgene op de grond te laten vallen dat de vegeer dra zou opvegen en schoonmaken, drie dampende drolbollen. (D/V 736)

Het paard, dat, bij wijze van spreken, geen poot meer kon verzetten, bleef staan, stak zijn trotse pluimstaart hoog in de lucht en droeg zijn steentje bij door iets op de grond te laten vallen wat de vegeer meteen zou wegborstelen en opvegen: drie dampende paardevijgen. (D/C&N 697)

Het paard dat als het ware op zijn laatste vier benen liep, bleef staan, hief hoog een fier uitwaaiierende staart, en deed zijn duit in het zakje door op de grond te laten vallen wat de vegeer spoedig zou opvegen en wegpoetsen, drie dampende bollen van drollen. (D/B&H 757-8)

The last contribution in *Ulysses* of what Hugh Kenner calls "the Vivid Narrator", "a few perfectly turned phrases that shine in the graceless syntax" (*Joyce's Voices*, 97) – and as such, perhaps even the odd man out in this chapter. Especially the rearing of the "proud feathery tail" and the parting shot of the "three smoking globes of turds" would not be out of place as a tangible gem in one of Stephen's more abstruse peripatetic meditations.

Having said that, there are still vintage Eumaeisms to be detected and transjected. The horse has reached the end of his tether, and “tether” being very appropriate here in the horsey context, the words “so to speak” are not only redundant but wrong. Vandenberghe uses an antiquated expression, *aan het eind van zijn tuier zijn* (the copycat of the English expression: to be at one’s tether’s end) which, being antiquated, has lost its figurative meaning and hence is not a joke anymore. Claes & Nys use the expression *geen poot meer kunnen verzetten*, literally “not to be able to move one foot” – that is, to be exhausted, which is perfectly possible. “To walk on one’s last legs”, *op zijn laatste benen lopen*, means the same, but if you add the number of feet of a quadruped, the expression gains in literalness and hence in silliness. Most of the time in “Eumaeus” we get figurative speech taken literally – here we have literal speech (the tether) taken figuratively, although the literal sense does apply. We could translate it that way, and say, for instance, that the horse was “literally au bout de son Latin”, but that would destroy the rare flower we have here.

For the Dutch equivalent of “added his quota”, both previous translations are beside the point: *droeg zijn aandeel bij* [added his share] is not an expression, and *droeg zijn steentje bij* [added his pebble] is not the right expression (you always add your pebble to something, but here the horse puts in his contribution in general). We opted for the expression “to put one’s dime in the little sack”, *zijn duit in het zakje doen*, which is often used for the more ineffectual pennyworths in a conversation – plus the *zakje* might be taken as the sack that is sometimes appended to the backside of carriage horses to drop their droppings in, which makes for a nice extra confused connotation, which we all are striving after.

The “three smoking globes of turds” have been less than adequately served by the *drie dampende drolbollen* (‘three steaming turdballs’, *drolbollen* being a joking neologism that doesn’t bring out the Joycean *mots justes*) and the *drie dampende paardevijgen*, which back-translates as if Joyce had merely written “three steaming pieces of horsedung”. Claes & Nys also disregard the unhappy immediate reduplication of the word “brush” by moving the second occurrence further down the road of the sentence.

Finally, we have a minor syntactical problem in Dutch. It is clear that the translation, just like the original, should end on the resounding note of the dropping of the turds. In Dutch the usual syntax asks for the verb to be put at the end. Both Vandenberghe and Claes & Nys decided to smuggle in a relative to which the last part of the sentence then refers: *datgene wat* and *iets wat*. Back-translated, you read then: “by letting fall on the floor *that which*” or “*something which*”, etc. Which doesn’t appear in English, so the Dutch phrase is decidedly weaker. In this case, because the sentence ends on such a high note, you may do away with the usual word order, all the more because the inverse word order, up to some sixty years ago, was quite usual in Dutch literature. The poet Martinus Nijhoff (incidentally also a translator and a critic) was quite fond of it. So we let the old-fashioned word order prevail here.

**HUNGARIAN (Erika Mihálycsa)**

A ló, miután elkészült munkájával, megállott és magasba emelve büszkén lengő farkát, maga is leróta adóját, amennyiben három gőzölgő citromot ejtett a földre, amelyet a seprő felkeféléendő és felsúrolandó volt. (H/G II 299)

[The horse, having completed its work, halted and lifting high its proudly waving tail, itself, too, paid its dues, insofar as it let three smoking lemons drop on the ground, which the broom was to brush up and polish up.]

A ló, hogy úgy mondjuk, minden erőtartalékát kimerítve megállt, és büszke kócsagtollként ég felé csapva a farkát, leróta adóját az útra, amit a söprű mindjárt el is fog söpörni és simítani, három gőzölgő lógombócot. (H/Sz 744-745)

[The horse, so to say, having exhausted all its reserve halted, and like a proud heron's feather skyward throwing its tail, paid its dues onto the road, what the broom would immediately sweep and smooth away, three smoking horse-lemons.]

A ló, minden erőtartalékát kimerítve, úgymond, megállt, és büszke kócsagtollként ég felé csapva a farkát, lepottyantott az útra, amit a söprű mindjárt fel is fog söpörni és suvickolni, három gőzölgő ganégömböt. (H/"C" 564)

[The horse, having exhausted all its reserve, so-to-say, halted, and like a proud heron's feather skyward throwing its tail, it dropped onto the road, what the broom would immediately sweep and clear away, three smoking turd-globes.]

The three successive Hungarian translations show a growing awareness of the stylistic niceties and multiple anomalies concentrated in the sentence, and in Eumaeian style at large. Endre Gáspár, although remarkably sensitive to the elliptic syntax of interior monologues for a translator working in the 1940s, ironed out most of Eumaeian gaucheness. His version tacitly substitutes a tame phrase ("having completed his work/task") for Joyce's double-decker idiom, at the same time removing the maladroit "so to speak", thereby precluding any possibility of sliding signification; the horse of this sentence would be simply resting out a day's work. He also straightens the strange loop in the narrative phrase: the horse's quota comes down unequivocally, before the broom has had a chance to make an appearance. The decisive downwards-tending movement (placed immediately after the upward surge of the tail and so creating a mildly funny contrast) is reinforced by the verbal prefix in the idiom chosen (*leró(ni) az adó(já)t*: pay one's dues): *le-* means "down" and, like verbal prefixes in Hungarian, conveys a perfect aspect to the verb, besides connoting direction.

Arguably the most symptomatic feature of Gáspár's version is, however, its shying away from the Joycean "turds": not only is the Hungarian substitute a euphemism, but it is the shortened version of the widespread, mildly funny euphemism (*lócitrom*: "horse-lemon") with the horsey ingredient removed, therefore a euphemism euphemized (to the point that a literal meaning of lemon intrudes). On the other hand, the sentence employs a verb form for the proximate future action of brushing and polishing that would strike the Hungarian reader as almost outlandishly pompous: the participle (*melléknévi igenév*) ending *-and(ó)/-end(ő)* of the archaic Hungarian future tense, extinct in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and long associated with 19<sup>th</sup>-century literariness, would confer a humorously antiquarian aura on Eumaeian discourse in Hungarian. The phrase is introduced by a pretentiously circumlocutional link, *amennyiben* (appr. "in so

far as”), hazily connoting cause-effect relationship. The humour is augmented by the fact that the pretentious endings adorn two verbs that are awkwardly mismatched with “broom” (*seprő*): both would normally take *kefe* (“brush”) as a subject – although it is hard to tell whether this addition to the array of Eumaeus infelicities was intentional on the translator’s part, or rather born out of a wish to avoid word repetition and opting instead for the (in)elegant variation of synonyms, a constant translation practice (as well as a stylistic device caricatured in “Eumaeus”). An even more interesting outcome of – most probably unwitting – added “wrongness” is the implication, in the double reinforcement of “the horse itself, too”, that someone *else* may also have added his/her *quota*, opening up elfish guesses.

Szentkuthy employs an idiom for “at the end of one’s tether” that only allows a figurative reading. Reinforced by the phrase “so to say” that *precedes* the idiom, the sentence seems to wink self-ironically at the reader, drawing his/her attention to the occurrence of euphemism. Most interestingly, Szentkuthy fleshed out the attribute “feathering” into a full-blown simile, turning the horse’s tail into a skyward-soaring heron’s feather, the one-time iconic ornament of (especially military) headgear; thus, an air of hussar bravura is lent to the plebeian quadruped, making the droppings come down all the more as a deflation. Szentkuthy also restored the narrative precedence of the polishing brush – however, the verbal suffix in the same idiom “pay one’s dues”, completed with the destination: the road, brings the action *down* to a completion before the actual mention of the object of those “dues”. The register is mock-elevated throughout, going slightly over the top; the closure, in place of Joyce’s ineluctable one-syllable “turds”, is a suavely alliterative *három gőzölgő lógombócot* – which, besides euphemizing, also inverts the rhythm pattern in the original.

The “Corrected” text, while taking over Szentkuthy’s high-flying heron’s feather simile, makes three significant changes. Firstly, it has a one-word collocation “so-to-say” follow the (same) idiom; this, seemingly insignificant, alteration nevertheless moves away from the gesture implicit in Szentkuthy’s sentence, of winking at the reader in complicity, and seems rather a hindsight reflection. Secondly, it replaces the idiomatic solution for “adding one’s quota” with a verb – a curious decision, since it weakens a prime stylistic device not only in this sentence, but in “Eumaeus” at large: of amassing (often incongruous) idioms, used here to the effect of heightening a sense of “literariness”. Apart from that, the verb *lepottyantott* [(*past*) let drop + *down*] lets the unseemly action out of the semantic and idiomatic bag, bringing it *down* to completion before the brooms make an appearance – thereby considerably weakening the sense of humorous narrative delay. The third and most important change is to give up the euphemism and use a word [*gané*: turd, dung] that is largely the equivalent of the English original. Incidentally, however, the cluster *három gőzölgő ganégömböt* [“three smoking turd-globes”: compound words are a standard feature of Hungarian] with its strong alliterative lilt deflates the (relative) shock-effect of the scatological word.

## 9.

A marginal issue on our list of samples illustrates the difficulties in translating dialect or, local diction - in this case, common Hiberno-English turns-of-phrase which are internal translations from the Gaelic. In the original, they have an effect of oddity, since they transplant the phrasing of another language into English, adding to the text's strategies of linguistic defamiliarization. How can one possibly approach this issue in translation?

**Is there Gaelic on you?** (1.427)  
**[Do you speak Gaelic?]**

**He is in my father. I am in his son.** (9.390)  
 [He is my father. I am his son.]

### **GERMAN(ic) and Romance languages (Fritz Senn)**

Können Sie Gälisch?  
 Er ist in meinem Vater. Ich bin in seinem Sohn. (G/G 30, 221)

The question is in faultless spoken German; the second implies a literal rendering, with no suspicion of a subcurrent idiom shining through.

Nichts mit Gälisch bei Ihnen?  
 Er ist in meinem Vater. Ich bin in seinem Sohn. (G/W 22, 273)

The question is a possible but slightly errant colloquial question; the speaker is aiming at some variation, but – inevitably – no Gaelic ghost is haunting the sentence, nor is this possible in any other language. This also applies to the French:

Est-ce que le gaélique est dans vos cordes?  
 Il est dans mon père. Je suis dans son fils. (F/A 25)

Connaissez-vous le gaélique?  
 Il est dans mon père. Je suis dans son fils. (F/M 18, 191)

In all cases “He is in my father” is taken at English surface value, with no hint of the underlying different sense in Gaelic. In the original Stephen’s phrasing fits well into his Shakespearean (and, for that matter, trinitarian) speculations and at the same time can refer to a filial situation — all well beyond the scope of any translation.

### **ITALIAN (Enrico Terrinoni)**

Lo parla, lei, un po’ di gaelico? (I/T 43)

Mastica il gaelico lei? (I/DA 21)

The oddity of the phrasing, whenever Joyce employs the syntactical tools of Hiberno-English even if according to Mulligan's distortions, is felt more by Standard English speakers than by Irish readers, who are quite familiar with similar usages in everyday speech. This is the main reason why I always avoided using regionalisms, for I believe their effect on Italian readers would be too patronizing, if I am allowed to say so. On the other hand, putting things back in place like my predecessor did, means to obfuscate precisely that oddity which non-Irish speakers spot in passages like this. I recreated a rather odd but not unacceptable syntactical pattern employing the resources of clefting – *Lo*, i.e., “it” – and by repeating the subject – *lei*, i.e., formal “you” – which was already implied in the choice of the third person singular – *parla*: “speaks”. The effect is rather defamiliarizing, but not too much, especially if the passage is read by people from some areas in the north of Italy. What I wanted to do here – which by the way I attempted to do in other parts of the book, like when Mulligan mocks Synge's speech patterns “Scylla and Charybdis”, or all the way through the “Cyclops” episode – was to mark the fact that sometimes the language spoken is not the standard one; but, in order to do this I never went – but in one case, I must admit – for the use of regional variants. I always played with registers, and in Italian, as I believe in many other languages, registers rely a lot upon syntactical structures.

#### **DUTCH (Erik Bindervoet and Robbert-Jan Henkes)**

Kent u niet wat Keltisch? (D/V 20)

Kent ge Gaëlich? (D/C&N 19)

Zit er Gaelic aan u? (D/B&H 20)

Hij is in mijn vader. Ik ben in zijn zoon. (D/V 227, D/C&N 210, D/B&H 232)

How to make noticeable that the language spoken is Anglo-Irish and/or Hiberno-English? There is no such thing, unfortunately, as Hiberno-Dutch or Dutch-Irish. In this case, the easiest solution, the one in front of your nose, is the best: do it literally. *Zit er Gaelic aan u?*

The fact that nobody would say it that way in Dutch, will make a little bell rinkle, as we say in Dutch, and voilà, the answer the reader comes up with is: it must be the lingo of the land. Bingo.

Claes & Nys, alas, try to work their way out using the old-fashioned/regional vocative *ge* instead of *je*, *jij* or *u*, which makes it sound like Flemish, Southern provincial Dutch or just bookish, and the strange *Gaëlich* thrown in for good, that is, bad measure, the reader's conclusion being inescapably that Malachi is facetiously bookish, instead of being facetiously Anglo-Irish.

Vandenbergh's *Kent u niet wat Keltisch?* (20), on the other hand, is all too bland and non-committal and shows no sign of a non-standard language.

The second Hibernicism, “He is in my father. I am in his son” can also be literally translated, but the 100% risk is that the Hibernicism will not be picked up. Which is not so bad, because in English, for the non-Irish reader,

chances are that it won't be picked up either. All three Dutchies have here the same translation. A rare occasion. Hooray, hooray, hooray. That calls for a drink.

**Fritz Senn**

*fritzsenn@mac.com*

*Zurich James Joyce Foundation*

**Erika Mihálycsa**

*erika.mihalycsa@gmail.com*

*PhD, Professor, Babes-Bolyai University, Romania*

**Jolanta Wawrzycka**

*jolanta@radford.edu*

*PhD, Professor, Radford University, USA*