The influence of foregrounding on retranslation:
The phenomenon of 'unretranslatability' in Joyce's *Ulysses*

Guillermo Sanz Gallego
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, VUB

Erika Mihálycsa
Babeş-Bolyai University

Monica Paulis
University of Antwerp

Arvi Sepp
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, VUB

Jolanta Wawrzycka
Radford University

Abstract

The present paper aims at exploring patterns of translational overlap in passages that retranslators recover from previous translations in a series of excerpts from Joyce's Ulysses in German, Italian, Hungarian, Polish, and Spanish. Drawing on Van Poucke (2020), who has proved that retranslations tend to show an overlap of 50% to 60% of the words compared to previous translations, we aim at outlining patterns of 'unretranslatability' – a phenomenon that we define as a forced or imperative coincidence between first translation(s) and retranslation(s) – by reducing the number of translation options, and focusing on passages with foregrounding. Accordingly, we suggest the 'unretranslatability hypothesis': If a first translation manages to reproduce a passage with foregrounding maintaining the same effect expressed in the source text, then the options for alternative translations are reduced to such an extent that a case of unretranslatability might be provoked. In the present study we observe that the 'unretranslatability hypothesis' can hold in a variety of language combinations if the two premises are met. One of the major implications of the study is that we can trace patterns of overlap in retranslations. Future research should further sketch those patterns in detail at different levels.

1. Introduction

The past thirty years have witnessed a growing interest in what started as a research topic, and has now become a branch within translation studies, or even a discipline *in se*, "retranslation studies", as Berk Albachten and Tahir Gürçağlar (2019, p. 1) claim. The large amount of conferences, special issues, and case studies that since then revolve around retranslation show that the current academic fascination toward the topic might not be an ephemeral trend, but rather the emergence of a new subdiscipline that has come to stay. Thanks to the specificity of its cases, approaches, hypotheses, and research methodologies, studies on retranslation manage to shed light on other aspects of the phenomenon of translation.

It is undeniable that within "retranslation studies", a specific theory has dominated the academic debate since the beginning. The ubiquitous character of the "retranslation hypothesis" – as coined by Chesterman (2000), referring to Berman (1990) – has had a huge impact on research into retranslation, and, in particular, on the approaches adopted by researchers. Throughout the years, the academic community has witnessed how innumerable scholars have attempted to test this hypothesis with mixed results. The main conclusion we can draw in this regard is that, depending on the language combination – among other aspects –, the retranslation hypothesis may be confirmed in some case studies, but it may not be valid in many others.

With its name, the "retranslation hypothesis" has linked the phenomenon of retranslation as a whole to 1) a specific methodology – of comparative, contrastive analysis between first or early translation(s) and retranslation(s); and 2) to a specific and pre-defined conclusion – retranslations are supposed to be 'closer' to the original (Berman, 1990; Bensimon, 1990; Chesterman, 2000). Despite Chesterman's (2000, p. 23) insistence that what he says about retranslation is but a descriptive, and not a universal nor even predictive hypothesis, and that exceptions are surely to be found, and despite evidence showing that such a conclusion cannot be assumed for all languages combinations (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2004), the influence of the "retranslation hypothesis" is still widespread, and case studies aiming to confirm or infirm it for specific language combinations and historical periods are still being undertaken (see Peeters & Van Poucke, in the current volume).

Indeed, the "retranslation hypothesis" has provoked a biased and misleading effect in academic research on the topic. The numerous case studies that aim at testing the "retranslation hypothesis" are based on a contrastive analysis between first translation and retranslation, and accordingly, they all start from a very clear premise, namely that the first translation and the retranslation differ in one way or another. As a result, most case studies neglect any type of overlapping between versions in the comparative analyses performed.

Yet, in a recent research study, Van Poucke (2020) did focus on overlapping in retranslations. By focusing on the effect of previous translations on retranslations, Van Poucke managed to show that retranslations tend to reproduce – or "recycle", as Van Poucke states – between 50% and 60% of the words contained in previous translations. These results are extremely significant and are in fact evidence of the need to follow this underexplored and novel research path. Indeed, as Van Poucke points out, "a translator has only a limited number of ways to translate a ST" (2020, p. 23). Of course, this situation is applied to circumstances in which the source text provides the translator with a certain degree of freedom in the form of different translation options. Yet, there are cases in which the source text does not provide the translator with different translation options. This applies when specific elements of the source text reduce the number of translation options because of explicit and/or prominent foregrounding devices.

The novel focus on such foregrounding devices allows us to explore possible patterns of what we could call 'unretranslatability', that is, a phenomenon which we understand as a forced or

imperative coincidence between first translation(s) and retranslation(s) in a specific segment, sentence or passage[1]. We would therefore suggest the 'unretranslatability hypothesis', which can be stated as follows: If a first translation manages to reproduce a passage with foregrounding devices maintaining the same effect as expressed in the source text (i.e., by approximating the original's foregrounding device), then the options for alternative translations are reduced to such an extent that a case of unretranslatability might be provoked in specific segments, sentences or passages.

The present research study aims at exploring possible patterns in overlapping between first translations and retranslations. By comparing a corpus of translations and retranslations in different languages we intend to identify patterns in which the retranslators recycle entire segments from former translations. We believe that these cases of overlapping might share a combination of features that provoke a situation in which the translation options are reduced to such an extent that retranslators – and re-retranslators – are forced to reuse former translations.

In order to explore these (non-)retranslation patterns across languages, we will discuss a series of excerpts from Joyce's *Ulysses* in German, Italian, Hungarian, Polish, and Spanish. The selection of the source text is due to two factors. On the one hand, Joyce's *Ulysses* is a work that has been retranslated to all these languages – among others – at least once, as made explicit in a recent collection, *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st Century* (Wawrzycka & Mihálycsa, 2020). The second reason for selecting *Ulysses* as a source text is due to Joyce's style, which is rich in foregrounding devices, a crucial aspect for the hypothesis we will be testing. A third reason for selecting *Ulysses* as source text is due to the fact that the first translations have managed to render the foregrounding devices in such a way that they achieve a corresponding effect of the original. As a result, the use of *Ulysses* as a source text will allow us to create a large multilingual corpus of translations and retranslations, in which the source text is characterized by a challenging style for translators and retranslators.

2. Foregrounding

The analysis and test of the 'unretranslatability hypothesis' will be based on the notion of foregrounding. The working definition that will be used as a main reference is based on the taxonomies by Simpson (2004) – for whom foregrounding is "a form of textual patterning which is motivated specifically for literary-aesthetic purposes [… and], typically involves a stylistic distortion of some sort, either through an aspect of the text which deviates from a linguistic norm or, alternatively, where an aspect of the text is brought to the fore through repetition or parallelism" (2004, p. 50) – and by Miall and Kuiken (1994) – for whom foregrounding "refers to the range of stylistic variations that occur in literature, whether at the phonetic level (e.g., alliteration, rhyme), the grammatical level (e.g., inversion, ellipsis), or the semantic level (e.g., metaphor, irony)" (1994, p. 390). This description of foregrounded features can be further developed with other stylistic aspects characteristic of Joyce's style, such as unconventional syntactic constructions – e.g., ellipsis –, non-standard grammar, repetitions, alliterations, anaphora, assonance, consonance, overtones, multilingualism, rhyme, rhythm, as well as canonized intertextual references.

For the purpose of this research study, we will be comparing passages of the source text in which foregrounding devices are visible to their translations and retranslations into German, Italian, Hungarian, Polish, and Spanish. First, we will be discussing the foregrounding devices

---

[1]   The difference between 'sentence' and 'segment' that we have taken into consideration for our study follows the one adopted by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) in their taxonomy of translation procedures, i.e., a sentence would be placed at a higher level and may comprise more segments.

found in the source text, and then we will compare the different versions to analyze patterns of overlapping.

3. Theoretical framework and methodology

As stated above, the present study aims at providing an answer to whether patterns of overlapping can be found in retranslations. Therefore, we would like to test what we call the 'unretranslatability hypothesis', which is based on two specific premises: 1) the source text contains foregrounding devices, and 2) the first translator manages to reproduce in his/her translation a similar foregrounding device. If these two premises occur, the translation options for retranslators – and re-retranslators – are reduced to such an extent that they might recover the segment of the first translation in the retranslation, and/or in the re-retranslation.

Of course, these two premises are not always likely to coincide. In some instances, different foregrounding devices may occur in the same excerpt, and the first translator may only manage to reproduce part of the translation unit with the same foregrounding effect in the target text. Therefore, we believe that we should also broaden the scope of our research to observe different phenomena that take place when foregrounding devices are retranslated. In this regard, a discussion of the different possible scenarios that may occur seems appropriate.

3.1. Cases with two versions (T1 and RT)

In cases in which a source text has been retranslated only once, there are only three possible scenarios: 1) full overlapping or unretranslatability, 2) partial overlapping, and 3) full discrepancy. Firstly, we find a scenario of full unretranslatability when an entire coincidence occurs between T1 and RT. In these situations, the retranslator recycles an entire segment of the first translation. Yet, the overlapping may also occur only partially. These scenarios of partial overlapping would imply that the retranslator discards a part of the T1 segment but recycles another part of the segment. Finally, there are cases of full discrepancy between T1 and RT.

3.2. Cases with three versions (T1, RT and RRT)

Cases with first translations (T1s), retranslations (RTs), and re-retranslations (RRTs) are more complex, and, therefore, instead of three, there are five possible scenarios of full overlapping and discrepancy, and nine possible scenarios of partial overlap.

1. RRT=RT=T1: First of all, a full overlapping may occur in the three versions, which is what we call a case of unretranslatability;

2. RRT=RT≠T1: A case in which the RRT only recycles the RT can be understood as a confirmation of the latter version (RT), and as neglecting the first version (T1);

3. RRT=T1≠RT: A case in which the RRT only recycles T1 can be understood as a confirmation of that first version (T1), and as neglecting the latter version (RT);

4. RRT≠RT=T1: We may also find coincidence between the two first versions, but the re-retranslators, in their role as proofreaders of former versions, may discard them and opt for an alternative new version;

5. RRT≠RT≠T1: We may also find cases in which the three versions differ;

6. And then there are numerous possible cases of partial overlapping:

    6.1. RRT(+X)=T1+RT: We may observe cases in which the first two versions show discrepancy, and the re-retranslation is formed by a combination of parts of each version – with possible additions –, i.e., the RRT recovers part of T1 and RT, but it also discards part of T1 and part of RT;

6.2. RRT=RT+X≠T1: We may also observe cases in which the re-retranslation is formed by a part of the retranslation and other additions, but no overlapping with the first translation;

6.3. RRT=T1+X≠RT: Or cases in which the re-retranslation is formed by a part of the first translation and other additions, but no overlapping with the retranslation;

6.4. RT(+X)=T1+RRT: Cases are also possible in which the first translation and the re-retranslation show discrepancy, and the retranslation both recovers a part of the first translation – with possible additions – and provides inspiration for parts of the re-retranslation;

6.5. RT=T1+X≠RRT: A fifth possibility consists of cases in which the retranslation is formed by a part of the first translation and other additions, but the re-retranslation shows discrepancy;

6.6. RT=RRT+X≠T1: We may also observe cases in which the retranslation is formed by a part of the re-retranslation and other additions, but the first translation shows discrepancy;

6.7. T1(+X)=RT+RRT: Cases could also be found in which the latest two versions show discrepancy, and the first translation provides inspiration for parts of each version – with possible additions –, i.e., RT and RRT recover different parts of T1, while showing discrepancy with regard to one another;

6.8. T1=RT+X≠RRT: It is also possible that the first translation provides inspiration for a part of the retranslation, but the re-retranslation shows discrepancy;

6.9. T1=RRT+X≠RT: Finally, there could be cases in which the first translation provides inspiration for a part of the re-retranslation, but the retranslation shows discrepancy.

Retranslations and re-retranslations can be seen as quality assessment material, because an overlapping with a former translation can be understood as a confirmation or positive evaluation of that former version, whereas a discrepancy indicates that a specific version is discarded or unknown by the re-retranslators, who, accordingly, acquire the category of proofreaders or evaluators of former translations. In fact, former translations can be consulted by retranslators and re-retranslators as a form of reference work that helps them to compare different possible interpretations of the source text so that they can select the most appropriate one for that particular segment. If both retranslators and re-retranslators recover a segment of a first translation we can conclude that that specific segment has received a double positive evaluation, and, accordingly, an improvement of that translation would seem improbable. These are the cases that can be understood as examples of the phenomenon of 'unretranslatability'.

4. Discussion of the corpus

The work selected as a source text to test the 'unretranslatability hypothesis' is James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922)[2]. After the 100th anniversary of its publication, Joyce's work has undoubtedly managed to stand the test of time, and has long ago become a canonized reference in world literature. The numerous translations, retranslations, and re-retranslations of this work are an evidence of the high influence of Joyce's work and style in modern literature. The selection of *Ulysses* as a source text is also due to Joyce's style, which provides an ideal setting to explore overlapping patterns and to test the 'unretranslatability hypothesis', since the first requirement of this hypothesis – foregrounding devices in the source text – is sure to be fulfilled. Also, the fact that this work has been extensively translated and retranslated provides us with a valuable

---

[2] In the analysis section, references to the source text will follow the conventions used in Joyce studies, i.e., *Ulysses* abbreviated as *U*, followed by the chapter number and the line.

corpus. The comparative analysis between translations and retranslations will be discussed below in subsections per target language. The selected passage of the source text will be compared to three translations per language, except for the case of the German translations, in which we will compare the source text to only two translations since the third translation is in fact a re-edition of the second translation.

There are three German translations of *Ulysses*. The first translation was carried out by Georg Goyert and it was published in Zürich by Rhein Verlag in 1927. The Goyert translation underwent two revisions, one still in Joyce's lifetime. After this version, two other translations have been published, the former in 1975 and the latter in 2018, both of them by Hans Wollschläger and with the publishing house Suhrkamp. Wollschläger's latest translation was revised by Harald Beck, Ruth Frehner, and Ursula Zeller, in consultation with Fritz Senn. The "revised Wollschläger" could not be published officially, not having the permission of the Wollschläger Estate. As said above, for the German analysis, we have compared the first translation by Goyert with the commented re-edition of the second translation by Wollschläger, published by Suhrkamp in 2004.

Joyce's *Ulysses* was first translated into Italian in 1960 by De Angelis. During the following six decades, however, six retranslations were published: in 1995 (Flecchia), 2012 (Terrinoni – later updated and re-edited in 2021), 2013 (Celati), 2020 (Biondi), and 2021 (Ceni). Some of the retranslators (e.g., Flecchia and Terrinoni) have made use of critical texts, such as Gifford's annotations (Gifford, 1974), and have paid attention to intertextual references and to the translational solutions presented in previous (re)translations, striving moreover to produce an apparatus of footnotes as extensive and exhaustive as possible. Others, by contrast, have imprinted a more personal linguistic and stylistic character on the text, e.g., by prioritizing the rendering of the original musicality over accuracy (e.g., Celati), or by letting their own colloquial voice be clearly perceivable in more informal notes to the text (e.g., Biondi). The Italian translations that will be analysed within this project are De Angelis's (1960), Terrinoni's (2012) and Biondi's (2020).

To date, three Hungarian translations of *Ulysses* exist, by Endre Gáspár (1947), Miklós Szentkuthy (1974, revised in 1986), and by the translator team András Kappanyos – Marianna Gula – Dávid Szolláth – Gábor Zoltán Kiss (2012, revised in 2021). However, the 2012 *Ulysses* (RRT) is a partial retranslation and thorough re-editing of Szentkuthy's stylistically exuberant version (RT), occasionally also reverting to Gáspár's solutions (T1), described by the team members as a 'remake' of the 'canonic' Szentkuthy text (Gula, 2012, 2020), a circumstance that renders the term 're-retranslation' somewhat problematic. Nevertheless, a correlation can be established between the taking over into RRT of those segments and passages where T1 and/or RT achieve a high level of foregrounding of characteristic Joycean style effects.

For over half a century, the Polish language had only one full translation of *Ulysses*, published by Maciej Słomczyński in 1969/1992 (T1). In October 2021, the second translation (RT) was published by Maciej Świerkocki. In her on-going, unpublished translation (RRT), Jolanta Wawrzycka is producing a new text which will not be a "corrected" text based on Słomczyński's (or Świerkocki's) translation.

The first Spanish translation of *Ulysses*, finally, was published in 1945 in Argentina by José Salas Subirat. Despite Franco's totalitarian regime, there is evidence that this version circulated in Spain since 1947 (Lázaro, 2001; Sanz Gallego, 2013). A second translation by Spanish poet and scholar José María Valverde was published in Barcelona in 1976, a translation in which, among other features, the Americanisms of the former version by Salas Subirat were replaced by a more peninsular linguistic variation. The third translation that we will cover in our analysis will be the one published in 1999 and conducted in duo by the Spanish scholars Francisco García

Tortosa and María Luisa Venegas Lagüéns.

5. Analysis

5.1. German translations

The selected passages for the German analysis have been taken from the episode 'Scylla and Charybdis', due to the evident foregrounding in the form of numerous intertextual references to *Hamlet*, and in Joyce's imitation of Shakespeare's style, and in particular, of his syntactic constructions.

> Excerpt 1:
>
> ST:
>
> Elizabethan London lay as far from Stratford as corrupt Paris lies from virgin Dublin. Who is the ghost from the *limbo patrum*, returning to the world that has forgotten him? Who is king Hamlet? (U 9.149-150)
>
> T1:
>
> Das elisabethanische London lag ebenso weit von Stratford wie das verderbte Paris vom jungfräulichen Dublin liegt. Wer ist der Geist aus dem *limbo patrum*, der auf die Welt zurückkehrt, die ihn vergessen hat? Wer ist König Hamlet? (p. 305)
>
> RT:
>
> Das elisabethanische London lag von Stratford so weit entfernt, wie das verderbte Paris liegt vom jungfräulichen Dublin. Wer ist der Geist aus dem *limbo patrum*, der zu der Welt zurückkehrt, die ihn vergessen hat? Wer ist König Hamlet? (p. 273)

This excerpt contains a series of foregrounding devices, such as the impersonation of the cities – in which one observes an overlap in both translations regarding the selection of adjectives –, the syntactic pattern of two rhetorical questions emulating Shakespeare's style in *Hamlet* – where overlap is also evident in both translations – and the intertextual references to Shakespeare – which are not only explicit, such as in the reference to King Hamlet and to the ghost in *Hamlet*, but also implicit, such as in the case of the Latin reference to *limbo patrum*, which, according to Gifford, is "Elizabethan slang for a lockup or jail, as in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*" (Gifford, 1974, p. 203). We must add that the multilingualism observed in the use of Latin is also understood as a foregrounding device.

> Excerpt 2:
>
> ST:
>
> *Hamlet, I am thy father's spirit*
>
> [...] To a son he speaks, the son of his soul, the prince, young Hamlet and to the son of his body, Hamnet Shakespeare, who has died in Stratford that his namesake may live for ever. (U 9.170-172)
>
> T1:
>
> *Hamlet, ich bin deines Vaters Geist*
>
> [...] Zu einem Sohne spricht er, dem Sohne seiner Seele, dem Prinzen, zu dem jungen Hamlet und zu dem Sohne seines Leibes, Hamnet Shakespeare, der in Stratford starb, damit sein Namensvetter ewig lebe. (p. 306)
>
> RT:
>
> *Hamlet, ich bin deines Vaters Geist!*

[…] Zu einem Sohn spricht er da, dem Sohn seiner Seele, dem Prinzen, dem jungen Hamlet, und zu dem Sohn seines Leibes, Hamnet Shakespeare, der in Stratford starb, auf daß sein Namensvetter ewig lebe. (p. 275)

Here we observe a case of unretranslatability or perfect match between translations in an explicit reference to Hamlet – or rather a "misquotation", according to Gifford (1974, p. 203). After that reference, an example of auxesis or amplification can be observed in the marked syntactic pattern in the reference to the son, which is further explained by means of an enumeration of his different facets. In this case, although we cannot speak of a perfect match or a case of unretranslatability *stricto sensu*, we observe that the overlapping between the two translations is remarkable.

Excerpt 3:

ST:

– Is it possible that that player Shakespeare, a ghost by absence, and in the vesture of buried Denmark, a ghost by death, speaking his own words to his own son's name (had Hamnet Shakespeare lived he would have been prince Hamlet's twin) is it possible, I want to know, or probable that he did not draw or foresee the logical conclusion of those premises: you are the dispossessed son: I am the murdered father: your mother is the guilty queen. Ann Shakespeare, born Hathaway? (U 9.173-180)

T1:

"Ist es möglich, dass dieser Schauspieler Shakespeare, ein Geist durch Abwesenheit und **in der Kleidung** des begrabenen Dänemark, ein Geist durch Tod, der seine eigenen Worte zu seines eigenen Sohnes Namen spricht, (hätte Hamnet Shakespeare gelebt, er wäre Prinz Hamlets Zwillingsbruder gewesen), ist es möglich, **das möchte ich wissen**, oder wahrscheinlich, dass er den logischen Schluss **dieser** Prämissen nicht zog oder vorhersah: du bist der enterbte Sohn: ich bin der ermordete Vater: deine Mutter ist die schuldige Königin, Ann Shakespeare geborene Hathaway?" (p. 307; our boldface)

RT:

– Ist es möglich, daß dieser Schauspieler Shakespeare, ein Geist durch Abwesenheit und **im Gewand** des begrabenen Dänemark, ein Geist durch Tod, der seine eigenen Worte zu seines eigenen Sohnes Namen spricht, (hätte Hamnet Shakespeare gelebt, er wäre Prinz Hamlets Zwillingsbruder gewesen), ist es möglich, **will ich wissen**, oder **auch nur** wahrscheinlich, daß er den logischen Schluß **aus diesen** Prämissen nicht zog oder **doch** vorhersah: du bist der enterbte Sohn: ich bin der ermordete Vater: deine Mutter ist die schuldige Königin, Ann Shakespeare, geborene Hathaway? (p. 275; our boldface)

The final example has been selected because of the repetitive syntactic patterns – evocative of Shakespeare's style –, and of the explicit intertextual reference to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* – such as "the vesture of buried Denmark", which, according to Gifford, alludes to Horatio's words (*Hamlet*, I. i. 46-49): "the majesty of buried Denmark" (Gifford, 1974, p. 205). This final excerpt is extremely significant because of the high level of overlapping between the translations. In this case, we have marked in bold the words that differ in both translations, which are only 8 out of 82 in the first translation, or more than a 90% of overlapping or unretranslatability.

5.2. Hungarian translations

The passages for the Hungarian analyses come from "Scylla and Charybdis" and "Penelope" and concern foregrounding devices of heteroglossia/dialogism, the echoing and parodying of

the voice and speech mannerisms of others, combined with a range of stylistic foregrounding devices such as rhythm, repetition, or unconventional syntax. They also attest to the translatorial creativity and fine-tuning still possible under conditions of (partial) unretranslatability.

The sentence below from 'Scylla and Charybdis', which satirizes the aesthetic principles of Dublin literati, displays an echo of the librarian's grandiloquent words, 'in the larger analysis', with striking foregrounding effects of unconventional syntax, rhythm and musicality. It illustrates an instance of RT/RRT adopting a previous solution combined with retranslation (thus, an instance of unretranslatability combined with translatorial creativity), where the level of microtextual foregrounding may be said to slightly decrease from T1 to RRT:

Excerpt 1:

ST:

Twicecreakingly analysis he corantoed off. (U 9.12)

T1:

Duplán elemzést csikorogva kitáncolt. (Gáspár, I, p. 146) [Doubly squeaking analysis he danced off.]

RT:

Renyikknyekkenve eltűnt a látóhatáron. (Szentkuthy, p. 226) [Re-squea-creakingly he vanished on the horizon.]

RRT:

Duplanyikorgó corantóban kitáncolt a nézőpontból. (Revised, p. 190) [In double-creaking coranto he danced off the perspective.]

The first sentence's syntactic, stylistic and semantic defamiliarization differs between T1 and RT. While T1 replicates the original's unconventional accusative construction 'creak[ing] analysis' (where 'analysis' echoes the librarian's words), for the latter phrase RT employs the rhetorically inflated 'a teljes látóhatárhoz mérve' ['measured against the entire horizon']; accordingly, in the excerpted sentence the librarian disappears 'on the horizon'. Neither T1 nor RT salvages *coranto*, but the rhythm of RT potentially evokes the dance's sprightly iambic-trochaic lilt. In RT the striking, rhythmic 'renyikknyekkenve' (a combination of the Latin prefix *re-* and a doubling of the onomatopoeia 'nyikk[an]' and 'nyekk[en]', whose standard use implies making a sound, respectively of bodies violently hitting against a surface, rather than creaking) result in a carnivalesque satire, whose degree of defamiliarization approximates and potentially exceeds that of the original.

RRT doesn't adopt the accusative 'creak[ing] analysis' but employs a phrase on 'perspective' (echoing the librarian's 'átfogóbb nézőpontból', 'from a wider perspective') which clearly follows the pattern set by RT. The phrase also imitates the dance rhythm. Apart from restoring *coranto*, its single most foregrounding effect is the compound 'duplanyikorgó' ('double-creaking'), with the appropriate Hungarian onomatopoeia for creaking. However, since T1 and RT already introduced the frontal 'duplán' and respectively the conceit of glueing a Latin prefix to Hungarian onomatopoeia, the RRT compound is arguably prefigured by these solutions and can be treated as partial overlapping. The passage illustrates a certain degree of structural repetitivity or unretranslatability when it comes to foregrounding unconventional style.

The next two examples of dialogism/heteroglossia come from Molly Bloom's monologue. An account of the monotony of life in Gibraltar features the sound of enervating, repetitive music with an acquaintance's remembered infelicity of speech. By linguistic accident, 'heass', the

plural of the repetitive syllables sung, also becomes a hilarious pejorative term:

Excerpt 2:

ST:

listening to that old Arab with the one eye and his heass of an instrument singing his heah heah aheah all my compriments on your hotchapotch of your heass (U 18.700)

T1:

ha azt a félszemű arabot hallgatnám és a recsegő hangszerét és közben azt énekli hogy hi hi ahi *gaturálok* a *hisz hisz retyerutyához* (Gáspár, II, p. 267) [if I were listening to that one-eyed Arab and his cracking instrument while he's singing hee hee ahee compriments on the hiss hiss ragbag]

RT:

mikor az a vén félszemű arab elkezdett énekelni hija hija ahija **azon az ütődött hangszerén adja át szíves üdvözlésemet az egész hija hija csürhéjének** (Szentkuthy, p. 861) [when that old one-eyed Arab started singing heah heah aheah on that imbecilic instrument of his give my greetings to all his heah heah scum]

RRT:

annak a vén félszemű arabnak is mikor nekiállt **azon a hülye hangszerén hija hija ahija adja át szíves üdvöszletemet az egész hija hija ahija csürhéjének** (Revised, p. 697) [(to) that old one-eyed Arab (too) when he started on that idiotic instrument of his heah heah aheah give my greetings to all his heah heah scum]

The level of foregrounding the error in T1 is the highest: 'gaturál[ok]' (corr. 'gratulál[ok]') implies a sorely uneducated speaker at odds with loan words. RT opts for gaucheness, using the wrong suffix ('üdvözlés', instead of the normative 'üdvözlet'), whereas RRT slips in a blatant mistake, the phonetic misspelling 'üdvöszlet' for the normative 'üdvözlet'. T1 adds one curious effect by rendering the second *aheah aheah* with 'hisz hisz': the hissing onomatopoeia is polysemic in Hungarian, potentially standing for H sharp in music, 'because', and the root of the verb 'believe/ trust' – compensating for the inevitable loss of the polysemy of *he-ass*. RRT adopts from RT the phrase 'give my greetings' with a variation, and also the translation of 'hotchapotch' (which in T1, in line with the original, is a mishmash of notes rather than a mishmash of people) with the strongly pejorative *csürhe*, 'scum'. This is a problematic slippage, as it adds a note of strident racism not corroborated by other passages in Molly's monologue.

In the next example, Molly sardonically recalls her consultation by the gynaecologist Dr Collins, whose medical terminology is beyond her reach, thus parodying another voice and likely mixing up omissions and emissions:

Excerpt 3:

ST:

asking me had I frequent omissions where do those old fellows get all the words they have omissions (U 18.1169)

T1:

megkérdezte gyakori-e nálam a *kimaradás* hogy ezek az öreg fickók honnan szedik az ilyeneket hogy *kimaradás* (Gáspár, II, p. 285) [he asked if missing/leaving out is frequent with me where do these old fellows get such words as missing/leaving out]

RT:

kérdezgeti hogy gyakran szokott-e lenni nálam *emisszió* honnan szedik ezek a vén *trógerek* ezeket a szavakat (Szentkuthy, p. 879) [asking again and again if emission occurs frequently with me where do these old churls/bumpkins get these words]

RRT:

kérdezgeti hogy gyakran *van e misszióm* honnan szedik ezek a vén trógerek ezeket a szavakat *van e misszióm* (Revised, p. 711) [asking again and again if I frequently have missions where do these old churls/bumpkins get these words do I have missions]

T1 is a literalist rendering of the original; the Hungarian term 'kimaradás' is suggestive of amenorrhea, not the discharges from which Molly suffers, and it makes visible no emissions-omissions error. RT strangely 'corrects' Molly's slippage, foregrounding the outlandishness of the term in Hungarian. Since in Hungarian both 'emisszió' and 'omisszió' are pretentious foreign terms whose semantic field slightly differs from English, mixing them up wouldn't be an adequate translation of the English original, as a speaker's unfamiliarity with the one makes familiarity with the other highly questionable. RRT, while adopting the structure of the phrase in RT, brilliantly smuggles back the error: by abolishing all punctuation marks, including hyphens, it blurs the line between the question tag '–e' (normative 'van-e', 'is there') and the potential front vowel of *e*mission (the doctor's plausible word), regaling Molly with hilarious *missions*. Example 3 also shows that, even with a high degree of repetition of earlier solutions, (re)retranslations can always foreground micro- or macrotextual style effects that play a pivotal role in Joyce's revolutionary textuality.

5.3. Italian translations

The following examples are taken from De Angelis's first translation (T1), and Terrinoni's (RT) and Biondi's (RRT) retranslations, and represent four situations in which the phenomenon of unretranslatability can be observed. Each example, moreover, presents a different pattern, displaying either an overlapping of all three (re)translations, or an overlapping of T1 and RT, or of RT and RRT. The first two examples illustrate what might happen in translation, retranslation and re-retranslation to elements pertaining to the source culture, such as idiomatic expressions (non-standard Hiberno-English grammatical constructions) and canonized intertextual references (Shakespeare citations), while the common theme of the last two excerpts is target culture intertextuality, introduced by Joyce either in the target language (Dantean citations) or in English (Dantean allusions).

Excerpt 1:

ST:

Give us [that key, Kinch, Buck Mulligan said, to keep my chemise flat]. (U 1.720)

T1:

Dacci (p. 170)

RT:

Dammi (p. 57)

RRT:

Dammi (p. 38)

In this first example, an overlapping of RT and RRT can be observed.

The Irish English 'give us', which turns in T1 into the literal but improbable "dacci", is in fact more accurately rendered by Terrinoni (RT) with the singular "dammi" (give me), as the Irish usage of this expression, and the context, actually imply. Since this solution already offers a correction of De Angelis' misinterpretation, Biondi seems to be presented with a case of unretranslatability. As can be observed, he takes over the singular form, agreeing with Terrinoni and hinting that he must also have noticed that De Angelis' rendering was based on a misinterpretation of the text, which was most certainly due to lack of familiarity on his part with this nonstandard grammatical construction.

Excerpt 2:

ST:

Names! What's in a name? (U 9.901)

T1:

Nomi! **Cosa c'è in un nome?** (p. 567)

RT:

Nomi! **Cosa c'è in un nome?** (p. 242)

RRT:

Nomi! Cosa significa un nome? (p. 264)

Although De Angelis does not add any note to explicitate the passage, he clearly recognizes Juliet's line from Act 2, Scene 2, as he provides its canonized Italian translation ("*Cosa c'è in un nome?*"). Terrinoni, on the other hand, not only recognizes the passage, but refers in a footnote to its exact location in *Romeo and Juliet*. Biondi alludes to Shakespeare's piece in a note as well, but at the same time states that he translated the citation freely.

Concerning the phenomenon of unretranslatability, the pattern that can be observed in this first example is the overlapping of T1 and RT. It can however be remarked that, although a fundamental prerogative for this phenomenon to take place is that retranslators recognize that intertextuality has been translated according to canonized texts in previous editions already, this does not automatically set the path for unretranslatability to actually occur. The fact that not all three versions overlap, might in this case be explained by Biondi's conscious choice to translate Juliet's line freely instead.

Excerpt 3:

ST:

Maestro di color che sanno. (U 3.6-7)

T1:

*maestro di **color** che sanno* (p. 204)

RT:

*maestro di **color** che sanno* (p. 70)

RRT:

maestro di coloro che sanno (p. 59)

Similarly, as in the second example, an overlapping of only T1 and RT can be observed here as well. In this case, however, although Biondi highlights in a note that the sentence was in Italian in the original already, he seems to have not recognized it as a Dantean citation, as he

transforms the poetical "*color*" into the standard "coloro", despite the fact that De Angelis had redirected the reader to the exact line in Dante's Inferno already in T1, and that Terrinoni, like his predecessor, had also recognized and taken over the citation as it is, furthermore specifying in a note that the verse in question can be found in Canto IV of Dante's *Inferno*. Since a scenario of consistent overlapping stretching from T1 to RT would have been expected here, this example might reinforce the idea that a fundamental prerogative for the phenomenon of unretranslatability to take place, is that retranslators recognize that intertextuality has been translated according to canonized texts in previous editions already.

> Excerpt 4:
>
> ST:
>
> Now I eat his salt bread. (U 1.631)
>
> T1:
>
> Ora mangio il suo pane che **sa di sale**. (p. 164)
>
> RT:
>
> Ora mangio il suo pane che **sa di sale**. (p. 54)
>
> RRT:
>
> Ora mangio il suo pane che **sa di sale**. (p. 36)

In this final example, although Terrinoni is the only (re)translator to explicitate in a note that the sentence is an allusion to a verse from Canto XVII of Dante's *Paradiso*, the three (re)translations perfectly overlap, showing that both Terrinoni and Biondi recognized the allusion and agreed with De Angelis' identification of the original Dantean verse, which made this line unretranslatable.

Worth noticing in this case is the fact that a more literal translation of Joyce's text would have been "ora mangio il suo pane **salato**" (salted bread), as opposed to "[..] **che sa di sale**" (that tastes like salt). Therefore, Biondi's choice of not retranslating the sentence indicates that he did indeed recognize this Dantean allusion and consciously opted to offer, like his predecessors, the original Dantean citation ("sa di sale").

5.4. Polish translations

The examples below show that the issues surrounding unretranslatability are quite complex in Polish; it is a fusional/inflected language whose intricate morphological plasticity gives translators a great flexibility to convey semantic layers or to resolve the conundrums of stylistic and grammatical formulations foregrounded in ST. It is tempting to give in to such a built-in linguistic suppleness. T1 handles Joyce's foregrounding of non-standard grammar quite successfully, though not without occasional writerly flourishes (Wawrzycka, pp. 128-130). T1 is also, for the most part, well-tuned to Joyce's register, something that RRT prioritizes as well (in addition to rhythm, cadences, and texture of word-sounds). Judging from the fragments under study here, RT pays great attention to semantics and occasionally slips into explicitation; it also eschews some of T1's straightforward solutions, effecting changes to the tenor of Joyce's phrases, as illustrated below. Though RRT proceeds independently, it frequently lands on solutions that are similar/identical to T1, corroborating aspects of the unretranslatability hypothesis.

Excerpt 1:

ST:

Stately, plump Buck Mulligan **came from** the stairhead (U 1.1)

T1:

Stateczny, pulchny Buck Mulligan **wynurzył się z** wylotu schodów (p. 5) [Stately [and] plump Buck Mulligan **emerged from** the top of the stairway]

RT:

Solennie napuszony, pulchny Goguś Mulligan **zstąpił z progu** u wylotu schodów (p. 4) [Solemnly bombastic, plump Dandy Mulligan **stepped down from the threshold** at the top of the stairs]

RRT:

Statecznie, pulchny Buck Mulligan **wystąpił z** wylotu schodów [Stately, plump Buck Mulligan **stepped out from** the top of the stairway]

The opening phrase of the book can trip translators whose languages hinder the possibility of "recreat[ing] exact grammatical equivalents" (Senn, 1986, p. 155). Where the English readers can enjoy the ambiguity of "Stately," the Polish translators must decide whether "Stately" is a descriptor of Mulligan or of the manner of his emergence from the staircase. In T1, "Stateczn**y**" is an adjective and, in RRT, "Stateczn**ie**" is an adverb. RT opens with two words: an adverb "Solenn**ie**" ("solemnly", "earnestly") that replaces Joyce's staccato *t*-sounds, giving way to the mellow flow of *o*, *le*, *-nie*, and an adjectival qualifier, "napuszony" ("bombastic"), that arguably alters Joyce's depiction of Mulligan, nicknamed Goguś. Joyce's "Buck" conjures up both an animal and a dandy of yore (Senn, 1984, p. 201); "Goguś" hovers between a "dandy/fop" and a somewhat effeminate "pretty boy." RRT's priority here is to stay close to Joyce's meaning, sound, rhythm, and lexical economy: ST and RRT convey Buck's emergence in eight words. And other that "plump" and "stairhead," this sentence has proven to be retranslatable in RT, courtesy of the dual nature of "Stately," though RRT returns it closer to T1.

Excerpt 2:

ST:

Ineluctable modality of the visible: at least that if no more, **thought through my eyes** (U 3.1)

T1:

Nieunikniona modalność widzialnego: co najmniej to, jeśli nie więcej, **pomyślane poprzez** moje oczy. (p. 31) [Ineluctable/unavoidable modality of the visible: at least this if no more, **thought through** my eyes]

RT:

Nieunikniona modalność tego, co widzialne; przynajmniej tyle, jeśli nie więcej, **myśl zapośredniczona przez mój wzrok**. (p. 76) [Ineluctable/unavoidable modality of that, which can be seen; at least this [much], if no more, [a] **thought mediated through my eyesight**]

RRT:

Nieuchronna modalność widzialnego: przynajmniej to, jak nic więcej, **pomyślane przez me oczy**. [Ineluctable/unavoidable modality of the visible: at least this, if no/nothing

more**, thought through my eyes**]

The registers of this phrase in T1 and RRT correspond to Joyce's original, with the caveat that both translations treat "thought" as a past participle (the "that" in the preceding phrase seems to support it). But it could be a noun. Indeed, RT interprets it as such, and explicitates "thought" with a six-syllable consonantal cluster, "zapośredniczona" ("mediated"), further thickened by consonantal "przez" and "wzrok" ("through" and "eyesight"). RT also explicitates Joyce's "visible" as "that, which can be seen", which alters the rhythm of Stephen's thought flow. Although, like ST, RT uses fifteen words, the phrase takes much longer to articulate.

Excerpt 3:

ST:

BLOOM: There is a memory attached to it. I should like **to have** it.

STEPHEN: **To have** or not to have, that is the question (U 15.3522)

T1:

BLOOM: Jest z nim związane pewne wspomnienie. Chciałbym go **mieć**.

STEFAN: **Mieć** albo nie mieć, oto jest pytanie. (p. 397)

RT:

BLOOM: Wiąże się z nim pewne wspomnienie. Chciałbym go **odzyskać**.

STEFAN: **Mieć** albo nie mieć, oto jest pytanie.

RRT:

BLOOM: Jest z nim związane pewne wspomnienie. Chciałbym go **mieć**.

STEFAN: **Mieć** albo nie mieć, oto jest pytanie.

The Shakespearian echo in Stephen's rejoinder is preserved well in all three translations, but in RT, Bloom's trigger word "to have it" ("mieć") is rendered as synonym "odzyskać" ("get [it] back; "retrieve") and offers no connection between Bloom's wish "to have" his potato back and Stephen's waxing Shakespearian. The exchange is, in a way, unretranslatable, and RT's rendition would qualify as a rewrite.

5.5. Spanish translations

For the comparative analysis of the Spanish translations we have selected excerpts that display interior monologues by the three main characters: Leopold Bloom, Stephen Dedalus, and Molly Bloom. These passages contain foregrounding devices in the form of ellipsis, alliteration, repetitions, and intertextual references.

Excerpt 1:

ST:

Heavenly weather really. If life was always like that. Cricket weather. Sit around under sunshades. Over after over. Out. […] Heatwave. Won't last. Always passing, the stream of life, which in the stream of life we trace is dearer than them all. […] and saw the dark tangled curls of his bush floating, floating hair of the stream around the limp father of thousands, a languid floating flower. (U 5.558-572)

T1:

Tiempo celestial realmente. Si la vida fuera siempre así. Tiempo de cricquet. Sentarse por ahí bajo parasoles. Partido tras partido. **¡Out!** […] Ola de calor. No **puede durar**. Siempre **huyendo**, la corriente la vida, y nuestro paso en la corriente de la vida que **recorremos**

es **lo** más querido **de** todo. […] y vio los oscuros rizos enredados de su **pubis** flotando, flotante **cabello** de la corriente alrededor del **indolente** padre de millares: **una** lánguida flor flotante. (p. 116)

RT:

Tiempo celestial realmente. Si la vida fuera siempre así. Tiempo **para jugar al** cricket. Sentarse por ahí bajo **grandes sombrillas**. Partido tras partido. Fuera. […] Ola de calor. No durará. Siempre pasando, la corriente de la vida, aquello que **perseguimos** en la corriente de la vida **nos** es más **caro** queee todo **lo demás**. […] y **veía** los oscuros rizos enredados de su mata flotando, flotante pelo de la corriente **en torno al flojo** padre de millares, lánguida flor flotante. (p. 136)

RRT:

Tiempo **divino** realmente. Si la vida fuera siempre así. Tiempo de críquet. Sentarse bajo los parasoles. **Tiempo** tras **tiempo**. Fuera. […] Ola de calor. No durará. Siempre pasando, **fluir de** la vida, que en **el fluir** de la vida **rastreamos** es más querido queee todo. […] y vio la **maraña** de oscuros rizos de su mata flotando, pelo flotante del fluir en derredor del **lacio** padre de **miles**, lánguida flor flotante. (p. 97)

This excerpt is taken from the fifth chapter, 'Lotus-Eaters', in which Bloom wanders around in Dublin. In this passage we observe Leopold Bloom's interior monologue, a broken syntactic discourse characterized by ellipsis and unfinished sentences. An additional foregrounding device is noticeable in this passage, namely the repetitions and alliterations at the end of the passage. Despite the length of the passage, the three translations coincide in a series of segments, such as the main alliterative elements ("flotante", "flotando", and "lánguida flor flotante"), whereas alternative versions are only observable at lexical level (see items marked in bold), but not at syntactical level.

Excerpt 2:

ST:

STEPHEN: (Brings the match nearer his eye) Lynx eye. Must get glasses. Broke them yesterday. Sixteen years ago. Distance. The eye sees all flat. (He draws the match away. It goes out.) Brain thinks. Near: far. Ineluctable modality of the visible. (He frowns mysteriously). Hm. Sphynx. The beast that has two backs at midnight. Married. (U 15.3629-32)

T1:

ESTEBAN: (Se acerca el **fósforo** a **los ojos**.) **Ojos** de lince. Tengo que **comprar anteojos**. **Los** rompí ayer. Hace dieciséis años. La distancia. El ojo ve todo **chato**. (Aleja el **fósforo**. Se le apaga.) **La mente** piensa. Cerca: lejos. Ineluctable modalidad de lo visible. (**Arruga** el entrecejo **intrigado**.) **Hm· Esfinge**, la bestia que tiene dos **lomos** a medianoche. Casada. (p. 529)

RT:

STEPHEN: (acerca más la cerilla al ojo) Ojo de lince. Tengo que **buscarme** unas gafas. Las rompí ayer. Hace dieciséis años. La distancia. El ojo lo ve todo plano. (aleja la cerilla. Se apaga) El cerebro piensa. Cerca: lejos. Ineluctable modalidad de lo visible. (frunce el ceño misteriosamente) **Humm· La esfinge**. La bestia que tiene dos espaldas a medianoche. Casada. (p. 495)

RRT:

STEPHEN: (acerca la cerilla al ojo) Ojo de lince. **Debo conseguir** unas gafas. Las rompí ayer. Hace dieciséis años. Distancia. El ojo lo ve todo plano. (**Aparta** la cerilla. Ésta se apaga) El cerebro piensa. Cerca: lejos. Ineluctable modalidad de lo visible. (frunce el ceño misteriosamente) **Ummm· Esfinge**. La bestia que tiene dos espaldas a medianoche. Casada. (p. 639)

This excerpt displays Stephen Dedalus in his stream of consciousness in 'Circe'. In this specific excerpt, we witness Stephen's thoughts in segmented sentences, similar to Bloom's elliptical interior monologue in the former excerpt from 'Lotus-Eaters'. Yet, Stephen's scholarly style differs from Bloom's in his frequent intertextual utterances, such as, in this case, echoes to Aristotle and to Shakespeare. Besides the high level of coincidence in the three versions (the differences are marked in bold), we observe a case of unretranslatability in the translation of the Aristotelian reference ("ineluctable modality of the visible"). In the case of the allusion to Shakespeare's *Othello* ("the beast that has two backs"), the only difference that can be found is the use of "lomos" in T1 instead of "espaldas".

Excerpt 3:

ST:

and I thought well as well him as another and then I asked him with my eyes to ask again yes and then he asked me would I yes to say yes my mountain flower and first I put my arms around him yes and drew him down to me so he could feel my breasts all perfume yes and his heart was going like mad and yes I said yes I will Yes. (U 18.1603-06)

T1:

y yo pensé bueno **tanto** da él como otro y **después** le pedí con los ojos que me lo preguntara otra vez y **después** el [sic] me preguntó si yo quería sí **para que dijera** sí mi flor de la montaña y yo primero lo rodeé con mis brazos sí y lo atraje hacia mí para que pudiera sentir mis **senos** todo perfume sí y su corazón **golpeaba** loco y sí **yo** dije quiero sí. (p. 728)

RT:

y yo pensé bueno **igual** da él que otro y **luego** le pedí con los ojos que lo **volviera a pedir** sí y entonces me **pidió** si quería yo decir sí mi flor de la montaña y primero le rodeé con los brazos sí y le atraje **encima de mí** para que él me pudiera sentir los pechos **todos** perfume sí y **el** corazón **le corría** como loco y sí dije sí quiero Sí. (p. 671)

RRT:

y yo **pensaba bien lo mismo** da él que otro y **entonces** le pedí con **la mirada** que me lo **pidiera** otra vez sí y entonces me preguntó si quería sí decir sí mi flor de la montaña y **al principio** le **estreché entre** mis brazos sí y **le apreté contra** mí para que **sintiera** mis pechos todo perfume sí y su corazón **parecía desbocado** y dije sí quiero Sí. (p. 908)

In this excerpt from 'Penelope', Molly's interior monologue shows this character springing from her role as a narrator of her first encounter with Leopold Bloom in the past to her role of a character with her repeated "yeses". The repetition of these "yeses" – a remarkable foregrounding device *in se* –, does not only help the reader to see the alternation of Molly's roles as a narrator and as character, but is also related to the rhythmic pattern of her interior monologue, since it also manages to set the pace of her narration. Again, the variations among the different versions are limited and remain at lexical level.

6. Conclusion

The comparative analysis proves that the 'Unretranslatability Hypothesis' does indeed have a certain degree of validity across the five language combinations tested. We have observed that, despite the varied range of languages – Germanic, Romance, Slavic, and Finno-Ugric languages –, the hypothesis is valid if the requirements are fulfilled, i.e., if the source text contains foregrounding devices, and if the first translator has managed to reproduce a similar foregrounding device. An additional conclusion we can draw from this study is that in these circumstances, the translation options that are left for retranslators and re-retranslators are reduced significantly, and, accordingly, they tend to consider the first translation not only as the most convincing option for that segment, but also as the only possible translation option. One can also argue that, in a way, in such challenging passages retranslators may be influenced – and/or even biased – by first translators.

Indeed, the results of the analysis are in line with the expectations of the hypothesis and overlapping tends to occur in passages with repetitions, alliterations, ellipsis, and intertextual references. Yet, we must also point out that the degree of unretranslatability observed differs, and some examples show a remarkable level of overlap even along passages with a considerable length. That is the case in the selected German passages from 'Scylla and Charybdis' due to the intertextual references, and in the Spanish selected excerpts with interior monologues by Bloom, Stephen and Molly due to the use of ellipsis.

Further research should be carried out in order to explore whether specific foregrounding devices are always more prone to provoke unretranslatability patterns than others. In the same vein, we have to bear in mind that the translations used for this experiment have been published in a short time span. Therefore, future research studies could benefit from comparative analyses among translations published with a larger time gap. Such an approach could shed light on the validity of the "Unretranslatability Hypothesis" in cases in which T1, RT and RRT were published in different centuries. We believe that further tests on the validity of this hypothesis from different perspectives and using different methodologies might be revealing not only in terms of translation assessment, but also in relation to other fields of study, such as the cognitive process of translation, and translator training, among others.

7. References

Berk Albachten, Ö. & Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (Eds.) (2019). *Perspectives on retranslation: Ideology, paratexts, methods*. Routledge.

Baron, S. (2012). *Strandentwining cable: Joyce, Flaubert, and intertextuality*. Oxford University Press.

Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de la traduction. *Palimpsestes*, *4*, 1-7.

Chesterman, A. (2000). A causal model for translation studies. In: M. Olohan (Ed.), *Intercultural faultlines: Research models in translation studies I: Textual and cognitive Aspects* (pp. 15-28). St. Jerome.

Gifford, D. (1974). Ulysses *Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's* Ulysses. University of California Press.

Gula, M. (2012). Translation as parallax, translating parallax: Miklós Szentkuthy's translation of *Ulysses* (1974) and its remake. In: P. Paparunas, F. Ilmberger and M. Heusser (Eds.), *Parallaxing Joyce* (pp. 214-238). Narr – Francke – Attempto.

Gula, M. (2020). "Wavewhite wedded words": The soundscape of the canonical Hungarian translation of Ulysses (1974) and its remake (2012). In: J. Wawrzycka and E. Mihálycsa (Eds.), *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st century* (pp. 87-102). Brill.

Joyce, J. (1993) [1922]. *Ulysses*. Oxford University Press.

Kenner, H. (1978). *Joyce's voices*. University of California Press.

Lázaro, A. (2001). James Joyce's Encounters with Spanish Censorship, 1939-1966. *Joyce Studies Annual*, *12*, 38-54.

Miall, D. S. & Kuiken, D. (1994). Foregrounding, defamiliarization, and affect: Response to literary stories. *Poetics*, *22*, 389-407.

Mihálycsa, E. (2017). The trials of foreignization: Transposing Joyce's farraginous chronicle. In: F. Ilmberger, P. Paparunas, and M. Heusser (Eds.), *Parallaxing Joyce* (pp. 239-266). Narr – Francke – Attempto.

Paloposki, O. & Koskinen, K. (2004). A thousand and one translations: Revisiting retranslation. In: G. Hansen, K. Malmkjaer and D. Gile (Eds.), *Claims, change and challenges in translation studies: Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Copenhagen 2001* (pp. 27-38). John Benjamins.

Peeters, K. (2016). Traduction, retraduction et dialogisme. *Meta*, *61*(3), 629-649.

Peeters, K. & Sanz Gallego, G. (2020). Translators' creativity in the Dutch and Spanish (re)translations of Oxen of the Sun: (re)translation the Bakhtinian way. *European Joyce Studies*, *30*, 221-241.

Sanz Gallego, G. (2013). Translating taboo language in Joyce's *Ulysses*: A special edition in Spanish for Franco and Perón. *Atlantis*, *35*(2), 137-54.

Senn, F. (1984). *Joyce's dislocutions*. Ed. John Paul Riquelme. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Senn, F. (1986). The narrative dissimulation of time. In: R. M. Bosinelli, P. Pugliatti, and R. Zacchi (Eds.), *Myriadminded man. Jottings on Joyce* (pp. 144-165). Bologna Editrice.

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A resource book for students*. Routledge.

Van Poucke, P. (2020). The effect of previous translations on retranslation: A case study of Russian-Dutch literary translation. *TranscUlturAl*, *12*(1), 10-25.

Wawrzycka, J. (2020). Translating the finger(tip). In: J. Wawrzycka & E. Mihálycsa, *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st century* (pp. 124-147). Brill.

Wawrzycka J. & Mihálycsa, E. (Eds.) (2020). *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st Century*. Brill.

Zhang, H. & Ma, H. (2018). Intertextuality in retranslation. *Perspectives*, *26*(4), 576-592.

Translations of *Ulysses*

German

Joyce, J. (1927). *Ulysses*. Trans. G. Goyert. Zürich: Rhein Verlag.

Joyce, J. (1975). *Ulysses*. Trans. H. Wollschläger. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Joyce, J. (2004). *Ulysses*. Trans. H. Wollschläger. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. Re-edition with comments by D. Vanderbeke, D. Schultze, F. Reinmuth, S. Altdorf, and B. Scharpenberg.

Joyce, J. (2018). *Ulysses*. Trans. H. Wollschläger. Revised by H. Beck, R. Frehner and U. Zeller. In consultation with F. Senn. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Hungarian

Joyce, J. (1947). *Ulysses*. Vols. I-II. Trans. E. Gáspár. Budapest: Franklin.

Joyce, J. (1974). *Ulysses*. Trans. M. Szentkuthy. Budapest: Európa.

Joyce, J. (2021). *Ulysses*. Trans. by A. Kappanyos, M. Gula, D- Szolláth, G. Z. Kiss, using the translation of M. Szentkuthy. 2nd, rev. ed. Budapest: Helikon.

Italian

Joyce, J. (1960). *Ulisse*. Trans. G. de Angelis. Milan: Mondadori.

Joyce, J. (2012). *Ulisse*. Trans. E. Terrinoni. Rome: Newton Compton.

Joyce, J. (2020). *Ulisse*. Trans. M. Biondi. Milan: La Nave di Teseo.

Polish

Joyce, J. (1969/1992). *Ulisses*. Trans. M. Słomczyński. Bydgoszcz: Pomorze.

Joyce, J. (2021). *Ulisses.* Trans. M. Świerkocki. Łódź: Officyna.

Joyce, J. *Ulisses.* Trans. J. Wawrzycka [unpublished translation in progress].

Spanish

Joyce, J. (1945). *Ulises*. Trans. J. Salas Subirat. Buenos Aires: Rueda.

Joyce, J. (1976). *Ulises*. Trans. J. M. Valverde. Barcelona: Lumen.

Joyce, J. (1999). *Ulises*. Trans. F. García Tortosa & M. L. Venegas Lagüéns. Madrid: Cátedra.

Guillermo Sanz Gallego
Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB)
Pleinlaan 2
1050 Brussels
Belgium

Guillermo.Sanz.Gallego@vub.be

Biography: Guillermo Sanz Gallego is Professor of Translation Studies at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), where he teaches Translation Studies, research methodology, and literary translation, among others. He is member of the CLIC research group (VUB) and of the International James Joyce Foundation. He has co-edited journal issues and published numerous articles and book chapters on Joyce's studies, on the translation and retranslation of literature and historic texts, as well as on the influence of ideology and censorship in translation. Together with Kris Peeters (University of Antwerp), he coordinates the James Joyce in Translation Centre (www.uantwerpen.be/JJTC).

Erika Mihálycsa

Babeș-Bolyai University
Str. Godeanu 7/53
400414/Cluj-Napoca
Romania

erika.mihalycsa@gmail.com / erika.mihalycsa@ubbcluj.ro

Biography: Erika Mihálycsa is Associate Professor at Babeș-Bolyai University, where she teaches 20th century and contemporary British and Irish literature. She has mainly published in the field of Joyce and Beckett studies, various aspects of European literary and visual modernism, and translation studies. Her articles and reviews have come out in *Word and Image, Joyce Studies Annual, European Joyce Studies, Textual Practice, James Joyce Quarterly, Joyce Studies in Italy, HJEAS* and in numerous edited volumes. She co-edited the volume *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st Century* (Brill 2020) and published *"A wretchedness to defend": Reading Beckett's Letters* (2022). Editor of Rareș Moldovan's new, annotated Romanian translation of *Ulysses* (Polirom, 2023), she herself translates between Hungarian and English.

    Monica Paulis

University of Antwerp
Prinsstraat 13
2000 Antwerpen
Belgium

paulis.monica@gmail.com

Biography: Monica Paulis holds an MA in Book and digital Media Studies from Leiden University (The Netherlands) and a Master's degree in Translation. She is a translator (Italian-English-German), and a PhD candidate in Translation Studies at the University of Antwerp (Belgium), where she is writing a dissertation on the Italian (re)translations of James Joyce's Ulysses, under the supervision of Professor Kris Peeters.

iD Arvi Sepp
Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Pleinlaan 2
1050 Brussels
Belgium

arvi.sepp@vub.be

Biography: Arvi Sepp studied German and English Literature, Sociology, and Literary Theory in Leuven, Louvain-la-Neuve, Gießen and Berlin. He is Professor in Literary Studies and Translation Studies at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel and research fellow at the Institute of Jewish Studies in Antwerp. His research interests center on comparative literature, twentieth-century German (Jewish) literature, literary translation, and autobiographical writing. In the context of his research, he was e.g. awarded the Tauber Institute Research Award (Brandeis University) and the Prix de la Fondation Auschwitz.

iD Jolanta Wawrzycka

Radford University
801 East Main St., Radford, Virginia 24142
USA

jolanta@radford.edu

Biography: Jolanta Wawrzycka is professor of English at Radford University, Virginia. She has lectured at the Joyce Schools in Dublin and Trieste and served as Trustee of the International James Joyce Foundation. Her recent edited/co-edited books include *Re-Translating Joyce for the 21st Century* (Brill 2020), *Reading Joycean Temporalities* (Brill 2018), and James Joyce's Silences (Bloomsbury 2018). She guest-edited Joyce/ translation issues of *James Joyce Quarterly* (2010) and *Scientia Traductionis* (2010; 2012) and published numerous book chapters and articles on Joyce. Her translation of *Chamber Music* into Polish appeared in Kraków (2019). She has also translated works of Roman Ingarden, Czesław Miłosz and W. B. Yeats.