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Joyce in Italy Translation, the 10th volume of JSI, marks a clear thematic shift in the field of research hitherto cultivated by Joyce Studies in Italy. The volume is, in fact, entirely dedicated to translation issues, a topic that is receiving more and more attention from Joyce scholars throughout the world. Cross-cultural encounters and linguistic differences have acquired increasing importance with reference to an author who made language central to his art, as Giorgio Melchiori noted some years ago in "Seven Essays and Ten Notes", collected in Joyce's Feast of Language (JSI, 4, 1995). From this starting point, and through a series of volumes dedicated to macro-themes of literary history that analysed Joyce's works in terms of the major characteristics of different literary periods (Classicism, Romanticism, Victorianism, Fin de Siècle), the present collection places Joyce at the centre of a crossroads of languages and cultures, a meeting point of Joycean texts as received in Argentina, Catalonia, Chile, Croatia, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Spain and Switzerland.

The editors, Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, who has collaborated with the JSI in the past, and Ira Torresi, an expert in translation studies and a professional translator and interpreter, have put together a very stimulating collection of papers that were given at two panels, both chaired by Bollettieri Bosinelli at the XX International James Joyce Symposium (Budapest June 2006), along with contributions by Fritz Senn, Serenella Zanotti and Cinzia Valenti.

With this volume, Joyce Studies in Italy, welcomes a predominance of papers by East and West European and North-American scholars, quite appropriate for a series which has always had an international dimension, and a volume that focuses on interlinguistic translation, one of the most important mediating bridges between cultures, and one which takes up the
The idea of representing Joyce at the crossroads, as the co-editors do in their introduction, seems a convincing visual metaphor of convergence and divergence. Italian Joyce, Catalan Joyce, Polish Joyce, Croatian Joyce, German Joyce, Spanish Joyce are not mirror images of the Irish writer, but rather, are expansions, irradiations, enrichments, and even impoverishments at times, who all meet, nonetheless as if they were newly discovered relatives coming together for the first time at a feast of languages to celebrate different cultural traditions at the same table. As the co-editors write in their introduction, "it is easy to see how the relationships between all such translations and their respective source texts, as well as the mutual relationships among translations (translations of different Joycean works in the same language; translations of the same work in different languages), criss-cross in a close network, or better, a web of networks (or rather networlds). And it is this web of networks, or crossroads, that the essays collected here attempt to describe and analyse". The coinage of the term, "networld", aptly represents the wealth of associations triggered by what we may call a trans-creation stimulated by the networlding of these many different texts, which we welcome here in this volume dedicated entirely to translating Joyce.

And what is the point of translation if it is just like the original?
Fritz Senn, 1994

Joyce and in translation has become over the years a recurrent topic at most Joyce conferences the world over. Most of the papers in the present collection were first delivered at the XX International James Joyce Symposium that was held in Budapest in June 2006. Participants in two panels chaired by Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, panels inspired by the recent publication of O’Neill’s Polyglot Joyce (2005), discussed the implications of approaching Joyce’s translations as a “macrotex,” and addressed such issues as intercultural transference, the image of Joyce in different cultural contexts and literary systems, the difficulties posed by Joyce’s formal experimentalism, and translations of Joyce as rewritings, adaptations and reinterpretations.

The ex-ego above pays homage to the first scholar who called attention to the importance of including translations in Joyce criticism by pointing out how even “mistranslations” can enrich our understanding of Joyce’s texts. As he wittily argued, “the search for errors in translations,
though deeply gratifying to our malevolence and a gleeful pastime of fellow translators, is perhaps the least profitable pursuit” (Senn 1984: 5).

In putting the collection together our intention was that of presenting Joyce at the crossroads of different languages and cultures, which is to say, a point of both encounters and departures. As an icon of twentieth-century modernism, Joyce extends a welcoming hand to multilingualism, cross-cultural meetings, bicultural intersections, and diverse approaches from different disciplines. This book is situated at the crossroads between Joyce studies, translation studies and cultural studies. As Wertsch convincingly argues:

“...attempts to account for complex human phenomena by invoking a perspective grounded in a single discipline are as unlikely to be productive as were the attempts of each of the three blind men to come with the true account of an elephant. The goal, then, is to arrive at an account—a kind of ‘translation at the crossroads’—that would make it possible to link, but not reduce, one perspective to another. (Wertsch 1998: 7, emphasis in the original)

There is no doubt that Joyce’s texts and Joycean translations belong to the field of ‘complex human phenomena’, therefore contributions from scholars who represent such different cultures as the European and the North American melting pot seemed particularly apt for drawing the image of a Joyce at the crossroads, like a monument to be admired and written upon, but also an icon at the centre of a rotary intersection, towering over and above the travellers who go around it on their different ways in order to reach their different goals. Joyce, in fact, not only as a writer but also as a human being, placed himself at the crossroads of different languages and cultures, sometimes bridging, sometimes highlighting the gaps between them.

The Joycean translations analyzed in the various contributions of the volume span the world over, from Croatia (Grubica) and Italy (Grubica, Senn, Valenti, Zanotti), to Germany, Switzerland (Laman, Pierce, Senn, Sullivan) and the Netherlands (Senn), from Spain (Caneda Cabrera, Pierce, Senn, Wawrzycka) – with a special emphasis on Catalonia (Aixas) – and from France (O’Neill, Pierce, Sullivan, Wawrzycka, Zanotti), to Romania (Ieta) and former Czechoslovakia, Poland and Russia (Wawrzycka). Some of them lead us across the Atlantic, to Argentina (Senn) and Chile (O’Neill), and even across the Pacific, as far as Japan (Senn). It is easy to see how the relationships between all such translations and their respective source texts, as well as the mutual relationships among translations (translations of different Joycean works in the same language; translations of the same work in different languages), criss-cross in a close network, or better, a web of networks (or rather networks). And it is this web of networks, or crossroads, that the essays collected here attempt to describe and analyse.

As Fritz Senn argues, all translations are by nature approximations; departure from the original text is always necessary in order for the text to travel into another language. Thus, examples of what have traditionally been termed “errors” in Joycean translation can certainly point to some loss of meaning, but also to a diversification and vivification of the original text.

Drawing on Senn’s decennial work, and building on his own successful book, Polyglot Joyce (2005), O’Neill points out how different translations cannot be judged according to one single perspective, but have different implications at the prototextual, metatextual, and transtextual levels, with the apparently paradoxical effect that patent translation “errors” may actually enrich the target text. For instance, a miscue in Fernandez’s 1926 French translation of “The Dead” (“Mount Mellary”) is changed into “Mont-Cilleray” phonetically resonates with an element of the immediately surrounding co-text (the characters are eating celery, or “céleri”, when “Mont-Cilleray” is mentioned), thus building, albeit involuntarily, a metatextual bond that is not present in the source text. This suggests that if we leave behind us the prototextual view according to which only the original writer (Joyce) has authorship status, all of Joyce’s translations form, together with their respective source texts, what we might regard as a single über-text or corpus, whose parts are closely tied by metatextual and transtextual bonds. The same holistic, metatextual or transtextual view of the “polyglot” Joycean corpus recurs across the various papers of the collection. In particular, it is enthusiastically adopted by Laman, who analyzes all four existing German translations of an excerpt of the Anna Livia Plurabelle section of Finnegans Wake.

The act of translation, in O’Neill’s perspective, always adds meanings to the über-text (rather than depleting the original text). After all, if we take the source text to be open to the reader’s active interpretation (Eco [1962] 2000) – and Joyce is as open a text as a reader can get – the translator is the first reader who has to fill in the obscure gaps in the text (Ferguson 1994, cited in Caneda Cabrera). The translator therefore produces and makes available to his/her target readers one of the possible
"second plots" which are embedded in the source text, while the final reader's interpretation becomes a "third plot" with respect to the original. In this line of reasoning, even when the translator "fails" to recreate some of Joyce's ambiguities and obscurities, forcing them into more explicit forms (as happens with Cabrera Infante's Spanish translations of "Clay", analyzed in detail by Caneda Cabrera, and with the Croatian rendering of some of the slang, literary allusions and leitmotifs in *Ulysses*, discussed by Grubica), he/she actually makes the negotiation of meaning between the writer and the reader more complex, and richer. In Joycean translation, the translator is inescapably visible — and although this might make non-translation-oriented Joyce scholars cry scandal, the real scandal in translation is pretending not to see that the translator is there, and should be acknowledged as a co-authoring figure rather than as a shadow of the original author (Venuti 1995 and 1998a, esp. pp. 31-34).

Venuti's idea of the translator's invisibility vs. visibility is taken up by Ieta, who highlights how a translator can be at the same time invisible with reference to the source text, by choosing to follow the original as literally as possible, and visible with respect to the target language, by twisting the linguistic and semantic resources at his/her disposal to best render the text. In the case of Joycean translation, as Ieta remarks with reference to Mircea Ivanescu's translation of *Ulysses* into Romanian, the two stances overlap fully, since a faithful (i.e., invisible) rendition should be as disruptive (therefore visible) as the original text. The same ambiguity can be applied to the domesticating vs. foreignizing dimension of Joycean translation: Joyce's language and disruption of prose genres is in itself foreignizing with respect to English standards; therefore, even if he/she tried to domesticate source texts, the Joycean translator cannot really do so without a foreignizing strategy (see also Venuti 1998b).

A practical contribution to the translator's visibility is Valentí's interview with Liliana de Angelis, the wife of the Italian translator of *Ulysses*, Giulio de Angelis. In the course of the interview, many interesting details about the translator and his work come to light, not only bringing Giulio de Angelis out of Joyce's shadow and helping interpret his translation as a final result (i.e., the Italian *Ullse*), but also showing how any translation is really a complex process that depends on a number of variables. Thus, as Liliana de Angelis highlights by simply recalling her life with Giulio, the background that shapes a translation includes not only the translator's education and readings, but also contextual elements such as his/her pri-

vate life, her/his relationship with publishers and revisers, and even details that may seem trivial to anybody but a semiotician, such as the mode of writing (whether typed or handwritten), or the mode of preparing for the translation (perhaps, as De Angelis did, with notes scribbled in different languages on bits of scrap paper and inserted in the pages of the original volume).

The concept of the translator's co-authorship, on the other hand, seems to inspire Sullivan when he writes that no translation obliterates the source text, just as it does not obliterates other translations, whether in the same or other languages. Each translation thus becomes a new co-text of a corpus that builds up around a common source text. In this process, however, the source text (or *source text*, as Sullivan calls it) ends up having the same status and importance as the target texts, and becomes one among many co-texts, and not necessarily the text of reference. In this framework, translation truly "becomes an act of cooperation between the author and his translator, who can call himself an artist, a creator, or [...] a poet" (Zanotti 2006: n.p.). This is why translators, if other translations of the same work exist, do not usually rely on the original text only. On the contrary, studying previous translations is an important part of the translation process; influences coming from the other co-texts of the same corpus are a factor that scholars need to take into account when analyzing any given translation, as Grubica extensively does when she discusses Gorjan's first translation of *Ulysses* into Croatian.

It should be noted that this perspective works particularly well with literary translation and literary translation studies. The same does not necessarily apply to other text types where not only the translator's co-authorship, but even the original writer's authorship, is often denied acknowledgement. When one translates a literary work of art, however, one has a special responsibility, which is, as Wawrzycka argues, that of re-creating the very *literariness* of the original in the target language, bending linguistic norms, if necessary, in a process that Wawrzycka calls "trans-semantification", a term which comprises sound, semantic, and intertextual effects. Correct trans-semantification accounts for the creation of a new literary masterpiece in the target language, which in itself reasserts the translator's (or trans-semantifier's) co-author status. In Joyce translation, trans-semantification is made particularly difficult by the fact that Joyce himself trans-semantifies English in the first place, bending its rules and the norms of the literary fiction genre, and involuntarily creating a potentially infinite number of "translation traps".
Two of the main generators of ambiguity — and translation problems — in Joyce's prose are undoubtedly intratextual and intertextual links. How can a translator detect and correctly interpret those repetitions that bind together sections of *Ulysses*, which are perhaps some 500 pages apart from one another? And how does a translator detect and reconstruct all the references to external semiotic texts which might have been pervasive in an early-nineteenth-century Dublin and Trieste, but may well be obscure and invisible in other times and cultures? As Pierce suggests, “Keep looking, listen out for the chords, seems the best advice when we approach a Joyce text”. Or following Aixís's example, look out for the rhythm and sound effects of the original text, and deconstruct it in detail before reconstructing your target text. Truly, one needs significant encyclopedic knowledge to understand all the examples discussed by Pierce, such as the intertextual references hidden in the very title of the *Portrait*, or the implications of the potted meat motif that recurs throughout *Ulysses* (intratextually) at the same time as it (intertextually) refers back to an advertising text, “What is home without Plumtree’s Potted Meat?”. In the momentous effort to uncover the intertextual references (or interferences) in Joyce's work, Pierce continues a tradition upheld by Eco (1966), among many others.

The same attention to allusive language and interferences is shared by Zanotti, who focuses her essay on the first Italian translations of selected parts of *Ulysses* made by Carlo Linati. Zanotti's analysis helps us understand the workings of domestication (Venuti 1995, 1998a, 1998b). In Linati's translations, domestication has several different causes, some of which may be considered part of a well-defined strategy, whereas others are probably unintentional. For instance, the intransitive rendering of the verb “to smell”, or the failure to see more than a literal meaning in terms such as “Peeping Tom” (whose referential content is therefore lost), seem to stem from misunderstandings or occasional gaps in the translator's knowledge of English. On the other hand, Linati's downplaying of sexual references and allusions appears to be consistent throughout his texts, and seem to fit in well with the rather prudish public morals that were dominant in Italy in the 1920s, thereby outlining a potentially more intentional domestication strategy.

Finally, from a translational perspective, the contributions in this book and the examples they analyze make it self-evident that the production and reception of translations — or literature itself, for that matter — cannot be considered as verbal-only, quasi-automated or automatable processes, but entail complex semiotic mechanisms and situational conditions that are integral parts of meaning-making. This, in turn, has enormous implications for text analysis and translation training in general, as well as what we might see as their combined product — i.e., training for literary translation. This, however, is another story, and it does not belong in a book which focuses, after all, on the translation of Joycean works, and not translation in general.

University of Bologna at Forlì
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**IRENA GRUBICA**

**ULYSSES IN CROATIAN**

There are two full-length translations of *Ulysses* in Croatian. The first was published in 1957 (and will be referred to as *UC1* in this paper), while the second, though completed on Bloomsday in 1989, did not come out until 1991 (and will be referred to as *UC2*). It is interesting to note that both translations, the first by Zlatko Gorjan and the second by Luko Paljetak, came out with the same publisher, “Otoker Keroavatar” from Rijeka. However, apart from a commentary on Gorjan’s translation by Ivo Vidan, a Joycean and one of Croatia’s most prolific academics, the two translations have never been analysed or assessed.

While there are not many translators who would dare to undertake the task of translating a novel as complex as *Joyce’s* *Ulysses*, both Croatian translators are well equipped. Zlatko Gorjan was fluent in German, French and English, and translated a number of novels and poems, including works of Dickens, Wilde, D.H. Lawrence, Melville, Kafka, Musil and a few works from the Scandinavian languages. Luko Paljetak is a published poet, dramatist and prolific essayist who works comfortably in French, Italian and English. His translations include Shakespeare, Chaucer, Byron, Blake, Malcolm Lowry and many others.

Gorjan’s 1957 translation was welcomed with great enthusiasm by the press. The book reviews, however, put more emphasis on the courageous undertaking of both the translator and the publisher than on the accuracy of the translation and the way in which Joyce’s linguistic, stylistic and structural complexities were rendered in Croatian. Gorjan was familiar with the two translations of *Ulysses* authorized by Joyce: the one in French by Auguste Morel under the supervision of Valery Larbaud, Stuart Gilbert and Joyce himself and published in 1929, and the one in German by George Goyert published first in 1927, and then considerably revised in 1930. Gorjan relied extensively on these translations, especially when
trying to clarify some difficult passages which he couldn't grasp in the original. He preferred the German translation to the French. According to him "it reads less easily, but the interpretation of text is closer to the original" (Gorjan 1970: 204).

It is important to point out, however, that Gorjan translated neither from the German nor from the French translation, as one might assume. He translated from the original English text. In the first place, this is testified by the fact that in the Croatian translation, some parts of the novel, with regard to semantics and style, are rendered completely differently than in the French or German versions. Gorjan also knew of the Swedish translation (Joyce 1946) which he did not, however, consult. Apart from these translations that he was aware of, there were some other full-length translations of *Ulysses* at the time: Czechoslovakian (1930), three Japanese translations (1931-1934; [1932-1935] 1952; 1955), Spanish (1945), Hungarian (1947), and Danish (1949). Gorjan translated from the 1952 Bodley Head edition. Apart from the errata list added to the Bodley Head edition in 1952, this edition basically corresponds to the 1960 Bodley Head edition, the one that is currently present on the book market along with Gabler's edition.

The first Croatian translation ranks among the pioneer translations of the novel. It came out three years before the Italian translation by Giulio de Angelis, published by Mondadori (which will be referred to as *UI* here), and before many other full-length translations of *Ulysses* in different European languages (e.g. Finnish, 1964; Portuguese, 1966; Slovene, 1967 etc.). In 1957, when Gorjan’s translation came out, there were many serious, academic attacks on Goyert’s German translation, and in particular by the German scholar and writer Arno Schmidt. Schmidt’s remarks, which had international reverberations, called into question the validity of Goyert’s translation and pointed to more than a thousand errors that occur in the translation. Gorjan knew about Schmidt’s articles but his attacks did not deter him from relying on Goyert’s translation. From today’s perspective, Schmidt’s comments, especially those on the compounds in Goyert’s translation which are sometimes composed of elements which seem to be chosen at random, and his liberal approach to the translation of the names of colours, can be applied to Gorjan’s translation as well.

For the most part, Gorjan’s translation reads as smooth rhythmic prose, and in some passages he completely succeeds in transferring the musicality of Joyce’s novel to the Croatian language. He was obsessed with rhythm, and his translation also abounds in rhyme, and verses from popular Croatian melodies and sayings. However, a closer reading and comparison with the original text immediately reveals that the translation is abundantly sprinkled with typographical errors to which nobody ever seems to pay attention. Names and foreign phrases are sometimes rendered incorrectly, and in the last chapters, one cannot get rid of the feeling that Gorjan’s translation was done in a great hurry. He omitted whole passages in “Ithaca” and there are many narrative incongruities. The errors and inadequacies range from simple misunderstandings of uncommon phrases in standard English, which is sometimes tolerable since at the time he did not have at his disposal the bulk of Joycean scholarship which we have today, to intolerable errors such as changing the masculine pronoun his into feminine her in the adaptation of Douglas Hyde’s poem that Stephen ponders quite often in the novel. These inadequacies, however, are common in early, pioneer translations of *Ulysses*. Unlike in Goyert’s translation, where some phrases, especially poems and some puns, are not translated into German but left in English, Gorjan translated the whole book into Croatian and tried to adapt it to the popular culture of the late 1950s in Croatia.

Editing can, of course, also influence the adequacy of a translation. In the first Croatian translation of *Ulysses* narrative misinterpretations sometimes resulted from the misuse of dashes. The interior monologue in “Scylla and Charybdis”, for example, is sometimes distorted and rendered in dialogue. On the other hand, there are many instances in Gorjan’s translation that surmount linguistic and cultural barriers and demonstrate his great creativity. These moments testify to his understanding of the important role that the playfulness of language has in the narrative dynamics of Joyce’s novel, something that, unfortunately, was not fully preserved in the second translation.

One of the greatest difficulties Gorjan had in translating *Ulysses* was dealing with the abrupt shifts in the novel between high and low registers. One of his solutions was using archaisms and, as he claimed, Latin-Croatian syntax (Gorjan 1970: 205). But Joyce’s novel also abounds in colloquialisms, slang, archaic slang, Dublin slang, localisms, and different substandard vernaculars. Thus Gorjan came upon words and idioms that couldn’t be found in any dictionary and he had to translate them intuitively. There was no dictionary of Croatian slang or urban jargon available at the time.
On one occasion Gorjan described his working method:

How did I translate Ulysses? In continuous feverish excitement and tension — although I knew the studies of Joyce by Stuart Gilbert, Ernest Robert Curtius (one of the first commentators on Ulysses), Samuel Beckett, Frank Budgen, M.L. Hanley, Herbert S. Gorman, Joseph Campbell, and others. In addition I had read the book (as well as all Joyce's other books) several times before. When I started translating, I did not reread Ulysses entire but grappled with an unfamiliar text each day. I admit that this is a very dangerous working method which I would not recommend to anyone: in case of Ulysses, however, I considered it necessary lest I should lose courage by reading one day the text I was to translate the next. I worked in this way for eight months, without a pause. (Gorjan 1970: 204)

Considering the fact that the 1950s were also formative years for Joycean criticism it should be pointed out that the list of reference books Gorjan consulted while translating Ulysses is quite remarkable, especially if one takes into consideration that not many articles on Joyce had been published or translated in Croatia before Gorjan's translation appeared on the Croatian literary scene. We can easily say that he was one of the most informed translators about the development of the Joycean scholarship at that time. However, his method of partial or segmented translation without an overall or complete grasp of the novel as a whole resulted in the unsatisfactory translation of many leitmotifs and led to many structural incongruities.

In the span of the 30 years separating the publication of the two Croatian translations of Ulysses, many considerable changes took place in the Croatian culture, which contributed in giving the second translator a new historical perspective in dealing with the novel. Urban slang and colloquialisms were introduced into Croatian literature in the 1960s and explored extensively in the literary works of many writers including Ranko Marinković, Antun Soljan and in the poetry of Luko Paljetak. Then, in 1981, a dictionary of Croatian slang came out, and later, many historical forms that Joyce experimented with in the "Oxen of the Sun" or "Cyclops" episodes were discussed and analysed in academic criticism.

The reason why the publisher "Otokar Keršovani" decided to publish the second translation of Ulysses was not, however, because of the many errors and misinterpretations in structure, form, and leitmotifs in Gorjan's translation (they had never even been discussed in any case), but because of the fact that the language of the first translation had become obsolete compared to the contemporary Croatian standard, and the publication of the Gabler edition in 1984 and 1986 was the right occasion to launch a new translation for the Croatian book market. Consequently, the language of the second translation, by Paljetak, is much more polished. It has more vivid urban jargon and colloquialisms, and idioms are less often translated by awkward collocations as was the case in the first translation. Nonetheless, Paljetak's work still has structural incongruities and discontinuities. Even though Paljetak translated the book in the height of the Gabler-Kidd controversy, it did not affect his translation. He took Gabler's edition and the variants it introduced for granted. This was, indeed, very common with translations of Ulysses that came out after Gabler's edition. In most cases a publisher would just ask the same translator to update the existing translation using Gabler's edition. However, there are also some remarkable projects like the Italian translation of "Telemachia" published by Mondadori (Joyce 1983). The publisher engaged different translators for different episodes, and each translator relied not on one, but on several editions of the novel and approached both Gabler's and the Bodley Head editions cautiously and critically. The new French translation edited by Jacques Aubert in 2004 relied on a similar approach. Each chapter was translated by a different translator, although the editor retained Morel's translation of the "Oxen of the Sun" episode.

The majority of corrections that Gabler's edition introduces appear in the area of punctuation, lexical changes and the insertion of new vocabulary. It also introduced episode numbers, which also appeared in the second Croatian translation of Ulysses.

I undertook a thorough analysis of the two Croatian translations of Ulysses for my master's thesis, and at this point I would like to digress to explain the methodology I applied. I focused primarily on the way literary
allusions are rendered in both Croatian translations of the novel, but of course, I paid attention to other linguistic, stylistic and narrative elements as well. It took me about two years to annotate the literary intertext in both translations. The annotations amount to far more than a thousand. When necessary, I compared the items selected for my corpus to the French and Italian translations of *Ulysses*. Therefore, the conclusions I came to do not stem from the impressions of the first, second or even third reading of the Croatian translations of Joyce's novel, but from a thorough comparison of the corpus I selected for the analysis. It is only because of that work that I dare draw some generalizations.

While analysing the way literary allusions are rendered in the two Croatian translations of the novel, I also examined if (and to what extent) the translators took into consideration those texts which Joyce incorporated in his novel, and which had already been translated into Croatian, so the corpus for analysis extended from the annotations I selected for analysis to an even larger corpus of excerpts from texts translated into Croatian. I also briefly dealt with the issue of the reception of these texts in the Croatian culture.

When it comes to literary intertexts in the novel, an important question arises about how to trigger the reader's response of the translated text by giving a particular literary intertext its adequate cultural marker. My aim was also to examine whether the second translation added something new in rendering some peculiar features of Joyce's language, and to investigate the relationship between the use of language and the creation of meaning in the text, e.g.: does the translation sometimes overinterpret the text? Does the new translation contribute to a better understanding of the dynamics of language and style in the novel? Does it add anything new concerning the construction of the characters and the plot? Since literary allusions are usually fragmentary items integrated into the structure of the novel, and permeating the whole novel, my aim was to examine how the successful translation of these fragments of literary intertext can add to the integrity of the novel as a whole, both stylistic and semantic. Does (and to what extent) the second translator take into consideration the first translation? What are the cultural barriers in translating Joyce? Is the Croatian culture reflected in the translations of *Ulysses*, and if so, how? To what extent is the translated *Ulysses* "Croatian" and to what extent is it "Irish"? Finally, I wanted to examine whether certain achievements in these respects are only partial, i.e., rendered only in some examples, or something constant throughout the whole translation of the novel. I am going to give an overview of some conclusions I have drawn while dealing with these problems.

To begin with, let me say that, as opposed to Gorjan who finished the novel in eight months, the second translation took double that amount of time. On one occasion Luko Paljetak mentioned that he completed his translation in sixteen months. Nonetheless, some of the basic structural incongruities that are so often present in the first translation, and which one expected to see corrected in the second translation, have not been done so. From the technical point of view, in any translation of *Ulysses*, one of the greatest difficulties translators encounter is keeping in mind the numerous leitmotifs: they probably exceed a thousand. They are often only a word or phrase, sometimes repeated even a few hundred pages later either in the identical form or in some significant variation. The novel is a dense network of leitmotifs interwoven into its texture, and which to some extent form its structure. Whenever they appear, they trigger associations with other situations, persons and concepts in the book. Tension in the novel is often created by the dynamics of archetypal, cultural, rhetorical and linguistic interrelations between leitmotifs which are laden with connotative meaning reflected in and on various narrative and stylistic levels.

In both Croatian translations some pseudohomeric epithets such as *windark* or *bullockbefriending*, as well as many frequent leitmotifs which are important for the understanding of the novel, are disregarded or translated at random. Many of these leitmotifs are very often literary allusions. It is the inadequate translation of many of these leitmotifs in the second translation of *Ulysses* that calls for a revision, which interestingly is also the case for many other translations of the novel.

The time span of thirty years added considerably to a better understanding of some words and phrases in *Ulysses*. Most of the time, the words the first translator found to be opaque in the source text were rendered in the target text with stylistically marked terms: e.g. euphemisms, hyperboles or vulgarisms. Thus, for instance, in the sentence "Behind her lord, his helmpate, bing awast to Romeville" (U3.374-375), "Romeville" is rendered in the first Croatian translation as "tornjate se dodjelava" (UC1 p. 62 line 41), which is a curse and literally means "Go to hell". In the second Croatian translation this is corrected and translated as "London" (UC2 p. 51 line 27), while in Italian it is translated as "La capitale" (UI p. 48 lines 24-25).
Slang and colloquialisms are rendered considerably better in the second translation, but when the translator had to come to terms with Irish slang he did not always succeed. One feels that the translator should have done some more research to find an adequate expression in Croatian. He just translated the words intuitively and did not always come up with very successful solutions. An intuitive translation of Joyce's slang is, indeed, common in those languages where there are not very finely developed distinctions between varieties of urban slang. On the other hand, in Croatian there is a clear-cut distinction between the urban and rural idiom, and in Croatian literature dialects are stylistically strongly marked. However, neither translator attempted to take advantage of this characteristic of Croatian culture.

The rendering of slang and the use of stylistically marked expressions in the first Croatian translation calls for a comparison with the first French translation and perhaps to some extent also echoes E. L. Epstein's comment on Morel's translation, that in some passages the reader has the impression of reading a conventional naturalist novel. However, this weakness does not overshadow many of the fine examples of very skilful, wry and exuberant use of language games in both Croatian translations, which significantly contributes to their rendering of the rhetorical and stylistic heterogeneity of Joyce's novel.

Another problem in translating Ulysses is caused by the allusiveness of Joyce's language. In translating literary allusions Paljetak relied mostly on his personal encyclopaedic knowledge, which is quite remarkable, but did not suffice to translate all allusions in an adequate way. He did not take into account, for example, annotations. On the other hand, in his translation there are some excellent examples of rendering the Shakespearean intertext in Ulysses, especially those works of Shakespeare he himself had translated.

Another one of the main problems in translating Joyce's literary allusions are various examples of "double coded intertextuality" - which happens when he alludes to different sources simultaneously and combines the linguistic and/or stylistic pattern of each of them. This is often the case with the combined allusions to Blake and the Bible. It needs to be emphasized that Gorjan, the first translator, had a strong tendency to emphasize the Biblical intertext in his translation of Ulysses, much more than the second translator. He was, it is interesting to note, a member of the board of consultants for the translation of the Bible into Croatian, and in particular he was in charge of rendering literary aspects of the Bible. Paljetak, on the other hand, perhaps not surprisingly, given his work with Shakespeare, translated Shakespearean intertext with more insight.

Another possible reason for some of the inadequate translations of literary allusions in Paljetak's version might be his very liberal approach to Joyce's syntax. Many elements of dislocation are disregarded.

When considering macrostylistic aspects of Joyce's novel we can say that Paljetak's translation is an important improvement upon the first translation. This is to a great extent due to the commentary by Ivo Vidan, who pointed out some weaknesses of Gorjan's translation. Although he mentioned many of the good examples of the way Gorjan sometimes rendered Joyce's style, Vidan commented that the "Circe" episode was rendered in an intense but too monotonous way and that in "Oxen of the Sun", the translator didn't manage to render the development of the English prose style adequately because there is not such a tradition of the development of prose in the Croatian language as there is in English (Vidan 1958: 325-326). As we can read from his notes, Paljetak (1997: 240-242) took into account Vidan's remarks. Consequently, he translated these episodes more carefully and thoroughly.

What I see as the most important achievement in the second Croatian translation of Ulysses is the translation of the "Oxen of the Sun" episode. Although again, on the microstylistic level, there are some incongruities that call for revision (inadequacies in rendering leitmotifs and quotations or modified quotations of some literary works), on the macrostylistic level the episode is rendered in a remarkable way. In order to render the diachronic development of the English prose styles, Paljetak used different language registers from various periods in the history of Croatian literature, and in particular, language registers of the Croatian Renaissance and Baroque literature, and vocabulary and syntax of 19th- and 20th-century Croatian writers. It is also important to note that he relied extensively on the dictionary of Croatian slang (Paljetak 1997: 246).

In conclusion, let me say that both Croatian translators enjoyed the playfulness of Joyce's language, its sound effects and onomatopoetic exu-
berance. Gorjan, in particular, delighted in, some aspects of Joycean idiolect related to word formation. Examples of “conversions” like “lips lipped, mouth mouthed” are very frequent in Ulysses. Paljetak was much more careful and moderate when translating these features of Joyce’s language, and sometimes they even pass unnoticed. On the other hand, in many respects, Paljetak’s Ulysses is an improvement upon the first translation. It definitely feels more urban than Gorjan’s, which usually relies on folk songs and archaisms, and Paljetak took into consideration more fully the Anglophone context — but did not render any marked distinction between different vernaculars.

Paljetak’s translation appeals more to the sensibility of the contemporary reader. It is also more consistent. Omissions are rare. Still, the inconsistency in rendering leitmotifs, impression in rendering allusions and names (sometimes they are really misinterpreted) calls for a thorough revision. But I would say that in spite of their shortcomings, both Croatian translations succeed, though in different ways, in transmitting to us both the “joy” and “juissance” of this great novel.
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