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Abstract

A Hubbub of Phenomenon: The Finnish and Swedish Polyphonic Translations of James Joyce’s Ulysses explores James Joyce’s Ulysses (1922) and its Finnish and Swedish translations and retranslations as polyphonic intertextual processes. I call this new, experimental view of translation – presenting translation and retranslation as a polyphonic hubbub of voices, a choir of competing and supplementary comments on a source text – the Polyphonic Translation Model (PTM).

Every translation is fundamentally polyphonic, as translation can never carry the source text over to a new target audience as such but must always rather represent the original text in its place in the new lingual and cultural context. In A Hubbub of Phenomenon, however, the focus is on translations of explicit cases of literary intertextuality and intermediality.

The study construes the process in which translations and retranslations form a polyglot macrotext, in which the source text is commented on, reread, and rewritten. The question is approached through Gérard Genette’s notion of palimpsest: the source text and earlier translations are present “under the surface” of a new translation. The relationships between these texts are studied from the viewpoint of intertextuality. The study focuses on James Joyce’s Ulysses, a source text in which the implicit intertextual nature of all texts is made explicit through intertextual literary techniques such as pastiche, parody, and the musicalization of fiction.

In my thesis, I study the way Joyce’s influential novel exists for Finnish and Swedish readers. The material of the study is the Finnish and Swedish translations of the book, which vary widely in their translation project and the horizon of the translators: Thomas Warburton’s Odysseus (1946/1993), Pentti Saarikoski’s Odysseus (1964), Erik Andersson’s Ulysses (2012), and Leevi Lehto’s Ulysses (2012).

Comparisons between these translations and retranslations make the problematic of translating intertextual literary structure become clearly visible. Furthermore, much of the cultural and literary value bestowed upon Ulysses was originally “found in translation”, as Stuart Gilbert wrote the first major study of the book on the basis of his conversations with Joyce during the process of the first French translation of the book.
In *A Hubbub of Phenomenon* I study how different translations re-create the intertextual material of Joyce’s *Ulysses* in a new cultural context. Literary translation is understood as a process, a polyphonic dialogue, in which various texts – the source text, its various translations into different languages, and different translations into a single language – act as agents.

The polyphonic model is based on Mikhail Bakhtin’s notion of literary polyphony as well as the productive translation criticism of Antoine Berman. Berman sees first translations and retranslations as a continuous, self-correcting process. In Berman’s method, translations are analysed on the basis of the translating position, the translation project, and the horizon of the translator. Berman calls the norms and expectations that define translation in a certain culture and a certain time, and the translator’s relationship to this discourse, the translating position. The conception of what the first translator or retranslator sets out to achieve, the composite of the translating position and the demands of the task at hand, Berman calls the translation project, an articulated purpose. The translating position and the translation project together are what Berman calls the horizon of the translator, the horizon of understanding in which the translation is received.

The study of the translations of *Ulysses* uncovers explicitly something usually implicit in the processes of translation and retranslation, but conversely the study of these particular translations also uncovers new aspects of *Ulysses*, and more widely the techniques of intertextuality employed in it: parody, pastiche, and the musicalization of fiction. In light of the focus on intertextual structure in the dissertation, the episodes analysed through close reading are episode 12, ‘Cyclops’ for parody, episode 14 ‘Oxen of the Sun’ for pastiche, and chapter 11, ‘Sirens’ for intermediality, namely the musicalization of fiction.

For the analysis of episode 14, ‘Oxen of the Sun’, I have created a digital companion for the study, *The Oxen of the Sun hypertext* (OSH). This novel and experimental device, employing the methods of the digital humanities, works as a machine-assisted tool for the reader of this dissertation. It allows a more extensive and intensive analysis on how the hypertext of the ‘Oxen of the Sun’ episode refers to its hypotexts from the history of English prose, and how these imitations are conveyed in the four Finnish and Swedish target texts.
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Pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli

The fate of books depends on the capacity of the reader

- Terentianus Maurus (fl. c. AD 200)
1.

**Ulysses the foreigner**

Introduction

When does translation begin? If one were to translate James Joyce’s *Ulysses* today into any given language, would the translation process begin with the initial sentence: “Stately, plump Buck Mulligan came from the stairhead, bearing a bowl of lather on which a mirror and a razor lay crossed” (*UJ*, 3)? The chances are, as the book has already been translated into over thirty languages,¹ that an earlier translation into that language would already exist. If the translator were to consult the earlier translation, in order to compare or to avoid the mistakes of the predecessor, would the earlier translation be seen as a rough draft? Would the (re)translation process, then, have begun at the conception of the first translation?

If the new translator, the retranslator, should opt not to look at the first translation, in order to ensure a unique and independent interpretation, she or he would most likely still be aware of the general cultural conception of the earlier translation, or s/he might have read it at an earlier stage. Consequently, the translation strategy adopted in that earlier translation might affect the choices of the retranslator. For example, if the retranslator were generally aware of a first translation reputed to be a “free”, “adaptive”, or “unfaithful” translation, to use some of the most persistent

---

¹ In his 2005 study on the multilingual macrotext of all Joyce translations, *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*, Patrick O’Neill (2005, 26) has offered a chronological and lingual survey of all Joyce translations up to 2000: “[B]y the year 2000 […] *Ulysses* could be read in thirty-two [languages in addition to English]”). Since then, we know that at least the Ukrainian language has had its first complete *Ulysses* translation by Oleksandr Terekh and Oleksandr Mokrovolskyi in 2015, and Iglika Vasileva produced a Bulgarian translation in 2004.
clichés of (non-academic) translation critique, she might be motivated to strive for a “scholarly”, “pedantic”, or “loyal” translation.

What about earlier translations in other languages, the multilingual tradition of translating the book, and the discoveries “found in translation” during that ongoing conversation? For example, in the case of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, after the discovery made during the first French translation process, in conversations between Stuart Gilbert and the author Joyce, of the “Homeric correspondences” of the book, it is almost impossible for any subsequent translator not to take those subtextual and paratextual links to Victor Bérard’s *Les Phéniciens et l’Odyssée* into account.¹ Do therefore all later translations of *Ulysses* into any given language begin with the first translation processes of *Ulysses* into French (by Morel and others in 1929), or even with the very first *Ulysses* translation (into German by Georg Goyert in 1927)? Are we still in the same multilingual hermeneutic process begun by Goyert over 90 years ago?

Moreover, what if the author is the translator, or part of the translation team of the first translation, as was often the case with Joyce? Joyce was consulted by the Morel, Larbaud & Gilbert translation team of the first French *Ulysses*, and he was a central part of the Italian translation team of *Anna Livia Plurabelle*, an early publication of the “Work in Progress” which was to become *Finnegans Wake*.² Are then the translation strategy and translational choices of that first “authorized translation” the norm for all translation processes to come, or is that translation a part of the original authorial composition process? Once this border is made ambivalent, one may ask whether the translation process begins with the original composition process.

To go a little bit further still with this line of enquiry, one may ask whether composition begins with manuscript, fair copy, authorial proofs, galley proofs, 

¹ Discovered in the sense that in 1930 Stuart Gilbert went on to publish the first major critical work on *Ulysses*, *James Joyce’s Ulysses*, based on those conversations with Joyce. This book contained the famous “Gilbert schema” of the Homeric correspondences of *Ulysses*. Joyce had, however, discussed some of these allusions earlier in his letters, most notably in correspondence with Carlo Linati, the Italian translator of Yeats’ *The Countess Cathleen* and Synge’s *The Playboy of the Western World*. Joyce sent Linati a schema of *Ulysses* already in 1920.

² In his seminal biography of 1959, *James Joyce*, Richard Ellmann writes about Joyce as translator: “Joyce, with his secondary passion for extending other languages as he had extended English, was hard at the French translation of *Anna Livia Plurabelle*. It had been begun by Samuel Beckett and a young French friend, Alfred Péron” (Ellmann 1965, 645). In the French *Anna Livia* translation of 1931, Joyce took the role of supervisor, whereas the Italian *Anna Livia* translation of 1940 is considered Joyce’s own translation (with Nino Frank and Ettore Settanni).
serialization, original codex publication or latest authorized publication. And what about when an author, as Joyce does in *Ulysses*, parodies Dickens, imitates Swift, or rewrites Homer? Does the translation of *Ulysses* today begin with the ancient Greeks?

1.1. Polyphonic voices

In this thesis I study the translations of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, a work which in many ways explores and experiments explicitly on the usually implicit nature of language and literature as recirculated stories, structures, words and styles, and examine how this cycle of tradition is rendered in four different translations, spanning over sixty years, in two languages.

The language pair I am concentrating on is Finnish and Swedish. There are a number of advantages in choosing these languages and translations with regard to the study of *Ulysses* translation, and the study of the dialogue between the translations:

1) Firstly, the two languages are very different. Finnish belongs to a small group of languages known as the Finno-Ugric languages along with Hungarian and Estonian. A characteristic curiosity in the Finnish language, from an English-language perspective, is the relatively rare use of prepositions. Instead of prepositions, morphemes are strung together at the ends of words through agglutination, creating the characteristically long Finnish words. Suffixes also make greater allowances for changes in the word order. Finnish is also gender-neutral, even in pronouns, a notorious crux for translators into Finnish. Swedish is a Germanic language, of the same family with English, with numerous prepositions and a similar standard word order, as in English, SVO. Swedish morphology is similar to English, with comparatively few inflections, and two genders.

2) Despite linguistic differences, Finland and Sweden are culturally close. Neighbouring countries, two Scandinavian, largely Protestant welfare states, Sweden and Finland share a common history up until 1809, when Sweden lost Finland to Russia. Swedish is still an official minority language of Finland. There are therefore, especially in Finland, readers who can read all four translations fluently and comparatively. Furthermore, the first Swedish translator of *Ulysses*, Thomas Warburton, was a Swedish-speaking Finn.
3) Due to the cultural affinity, these four translators have been explicitly aware of each other, and each other’s work, and have commented on these relationships. This is advantageous for the study of the dialogue between the translations, the question of how previous translations affect each other, and how the translation macrotext evolves as a conversation.

4) These four translations represent four very different strategies and aesthetics of translation, spanning over sixty years. The *Ulysses* translation history is neatly symmetrical within the language pair, however, in that the first translations into both languages of the book appear in the first half-a-century since the original publication, and then almost simultaneous - yet very different - retranslations in 2012 were produced in the year of the expiry of European copyright on the work of James Joyce.

5) Finally, it is not without significance that it is these three languages – English, Finnish, and Swedish - that I am to different degrees competent in. Finnish is my native language and I have studied Swedish since I was a small schoolboy. English is the language and literature I have studied and translated earlier in my career. In a study of 2005, *Polyglot Joyce*, comparative literature scholar Patrick O’Neill attempts to study the entire macrotext of all Joyce translations that have been produced. He makes an impressive effort but is necessarily confined to an analysis of dictionary definitions in many languages. In my study I make a decoupage from the entire Joyce translation macrotext and concentrate on those languages in which I can offer a more detailed analysis.

As my study primarily belongs to the field of comparative literature and only secondarily draws from and contributes to translation studies, I focus on how James Joyce’s *Ulysses* exists, or is becoming, in Finnish and Swedish in its four different translations, and the paratextual conversations surrounding these translations. In order to study the macrotextual Finnish and Swedish *Ulysses*, I need to study the tradition and the horizon from which the work springs (the source text context), the tradition and horizon to which the respective translations are aimed (the target text context), and what the hermeneutic conversation about the work and the translations is in that context (the dialogue of the translations). This continual process, this multilingual afterlife of literary works, in which the text is just one moment and comment on an
intratextual conversation that has preceded it, but also just one voice in a hermeneutic
dialogue that continues after it, has not been extensively studied in comparative
literature, even though such questions have been discussed in translation studies from
a translation point of view. The work, as the German Romantic writers and translators
thought, according to Berman (1992, 108) and Benjamin (2009, 42-5), goes beyond
itself by its translations.

The following axioms form the basis for my argument: Firstly, I postulate that
intertextuality, the nature of text as a mosaic of quotations, is a special problem area
for literary translation. This is a major reason why literary translation is such a complex
phenomenon. It is also why literary translation, as opposed to other translation areas,
has thus far not seen major breakthroughs by applying machine translation (MT) or
even the widely used computer assisted translation (CAT), but has remained the “last
bastion of human translation”. Furthermore the complex polyphonic and intertextual
nature of works such as Ulysses is a central reason why there is a call for retranslations
of such works into languages into which they have already previously been translated.

Also, I see a literary translation target text not as subservient to the original
source text, but as a literary artefact in its own right. I follow the thinking of French
translator and theorist of translation, especially of retranslation, Antoine Berman, that
translation is a critical, hermeneutic, and creative process. Translation is a process of
understanding the source text and the tradition from which it stems, and the translator
is a co-creator of the new literary work in its new linguistic, cultural, and aesthetic
horizon.

For Berman, all translations and retranslations of a work in a language area, and,
to an extent, also translations of the work to other languages, as well as other
introductory texts surrounding those texts, are part of the same process of the transfer

---

4 This formulation, like the term ‘intertextuality’ itself, stems from Julia Kristeva’s thinking, but the
term is widely and ambivalently used. Graham Allen (2006, 2) notes that the term ‘intertextuality’ in
contemporary critical vocabulary provides no set of stable critical procedures: “Intertextuality, one of
the central ideas in contemporary literary theory, is not a transparent term and so, despite its confident
utilization by many theorists and critics, cannot be evoked in an uncomplicated manner.” Allen
follows major moves in the term’s history in structuralist, poststructuralist, and deconstructive
theories. I will discuss my understanding of the term and phenomenon in chapter 2, “Never know
whose thoughts you’re chewing”.

6 Douglas Robinson (2017, 440-460) has expressed a view of translation as a unique literary genre, an
argument to which I shall return in chapter 2 on the Polyphonic Translation Model.
of the work to a new language, in the case of this study, Finnish and Swedish. All aspects of an intertextually explicit and rich source text such as James Joyce’s *Ulysses* may be impossible to re-create in another language in a single translation, where a translator may prioritize some aspects at the expense of others, according to her aesthetics, the task at hand, and the translation strategy. These choices may motivate later retranslations, either to go further in the same direction, to open what Berman calls *translation passages*, or to adopt a different approach, or a process, emphasizing other aspects of the source text, possibly the ones lost in the first translation. The resulting *polyphonic* hubbub of the translations results in a richer picture of the source text than can be offered by any one target text.

By ‘polyphony’ I mean polyphony in the formulation of Russian literary scholar and philosopher of language, Mikhail Bakhtin, as the multi-voicedness and multi-layeredness of poetic language (as opposed to the more general meaning of a musical composition employing several simultaneous melodic lines). Bakhtin (1984, 205) refers to Dostoevsky’s novels, and what Bakhtin sees as his refusal to use a monologic authorial voice. The polyphonic form is the artistic expression of the dialogic conception of truth, a truth that cannot be consummated by a single consciousness.7

Tzvetan Todorov, a Bulgarian-French philosopher and structuralist literary critic, writes in his 1981 book on Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogical Principle*, that central to Bakhtin’s view on utterance, or discourse, is that it is referential (something is said to someone in a certain context) and relational (there is no utterance without relation to other utterances), and the relation of utterances Bakhtin calls *dialogism*. ‘Dialogism’, according to Todorov (1984, x), is the “intertextual dimension” of the utterance. The complex choir of utterances always exists prior to any one voice entering, and possibly changing, it. Not only have words always already been used, but “‘things’ themselves have been touched, at least in one of their previous states, by other discourses that one cannot fail to encounter” (Todorov 1984, 63). ‘Polyphony’, on the other hand, is a form of artistic expression, which for Bakhtin is strictly seen only in the prose of Dostoevsky, a privileged instance of dialogism. Even though

---

7 This is not unlike Hans-Georg Gadamer’s conception of language as the site of tradition in the final section of *Truth and Method* (1988/1960). Gadamer’s hermeneutics concentrated on the community of understanding that the participants in a dialogue share through language.
dialogism for Bakhtin is almost omnipresent, the polyphonic novel is quite rare or marginal.\footnote{On occasion, Bakhtin builds an opposition between the dialogic and monologic utterance, and the polyphonic and the homophonic novel. At least this is the case in the following passage translated and commented on by Todorov (1984, 14) from K pererabotke knigi o Dostoevskom (“Toward a Reworking of the Dostoevsky Book”): “The problems encountered by the author and his consciousness in the polyphonic novel are far deeper, and more complex than those to be found in the homophonic (monologic) novel. Einstein’s world possesses a far deeper and more complex unity than Newton’s; it is a higher level unity, of a qualitatively different order.” Here the terms ‘homophonic’ and ‘monologic’ are even equated with Newtonian physics, whereas Einstein’s world represents the ‘polyphonic’ and ‘dialogic’ chronotope.}

As the dialogic aspect of language has since “Word, Dialogue and Novel”, the 1966 essay by Bulgarian-French philosopher and semiotician Julia Kristeva, been widely called intertextuality, I will in this study use ‘intertextuality’ as the term for the wider interdependence and referentiality of all texts, and ‘polyphony’ for the many active voices participating in the translation process of, in this case, James Joyce’s *Ulysses*. This requires two important caveats, however: One, I will assume that Bakhtin would have counted Joyce’s prose, alongside Rabelais and Dostoevsky, as an instance of centrifugal forces of language, and as a representative of the polyphonic novel. Two, briefly in chapter 6 on translating musicalized prose, I will use ‘polyphony’ in the musical sense. In those cases, I shall highlight the difference.

Finally, I assert that, just as the special nature of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* reveals something usually implicit in the processes of translation and retranslation, the nature of translation reveals new aspects of *Ulysses*. It might be argued that a translation does nothing to the original work; after the translation process, the source text still exists as it is. However, for a specific reader in a certain culture and language area, a translation of a work of literature she could earlier read only in a language foreign to her (even if she could read it fairly fluently) radically changes her view of the source text itself. She, as it were, now enters into conversation about the work, in which she negotiates the meaning with the translator and, whether she agrees with the interpretation or not, the original is not quite the same anymore. The same can be said when the voice and interpretation of a retranslator enters the choir.
1.2. Translational voices

James Joyce’s *Ulysses* is a book that challenges many of our basic conceptions of translation. A typical basic conception could be simplistically defined as follows: An original work (source text) by an author (sender) of a given language (source language) is rendered in another language (target language) for a new audience (target audience).

The first scholarly crux that *Ulysses* poses to this schema is the question: “What is the source text of *Ulysses*?” In 1906, Joyce informed his brother Stanislaus he was working on an epoch of a single day in Dublin (LII, 190). In the famous paratext at the end of the eventual 1922 publication of the book, Joyce informs the reader that the creation of the work has taken place in “Trieste-Zürich-Paris” in “1914-1921” (JJU, 644). 1914 was the year of publication of Joyce’s *Dubliners*, and also reportedly the year of drafting his play *Exiles* and the eventually posthumously published *Giacomo Joyce*, so that was perhaps a convenient year to name as the beginning of the composition of *Ulysses*. What is clear, however, is that he completed the early chapters of the work not in Trieste, nor in Zurich, but in Locarno (Switzerland) in the closing months of 1917.¹⁰

*Ulysses* is a thoroughly polyglot and intercultural book. The action is set in Dublin, and many of Stephen Dedalus’ experiences are based on Joyce’s life (as Dedalus is “the portrait of the artist as a young man”), but the character of the artist as a middle-aged everyman, a Jewish canvasser called Leopold Bloom, could not have been written without Joyce’s experiences of the plethora of languages and cultures in Trieste and in Zürich, and without friendships with polyglot and multicultural Europeans such as Ettore Schmitz (who published under the pseudonym Italo Svevo).¹¹ *Ulysses* is essentially a very European book, forged during the great upheaval

---

⁹ A term by Gérard Genette, *paratextual features* being bibliographical elements which adorn the “threshold”, “vestibule”, or “fringe” of the text itself, and help to determine the whole reading of the text (Genette 1997b, 2).

¹⁰ Cf. Ellmann (1965, 420-441) and Hutton (2019, 1-17).

¹¹ Fritz Senn, in his influential essays on translation as an approach to understanding Joyce, has written on the polyglot situation of the composition of *Ulysses*: “Additionally, largely by chance, he found himself from the start in a polyglot situation that did not diminish in its linguistic diversity, despite the moves from Pola to Trieste, then to Zürich, and finally to Paris, which took place over a period of fifteen years. Even before the move in 1915 to Zürich, out of exigency after the outbreak of World War I, Joyce’s life in Europe was polyglot in the extreme. In Pola (now the city of Pulj in Yugoslavia), where Joyce first taught for Berlitz, he would have heard Italian, German, and Serbian spoken on the streets” (Senn 1984, xvii).
of imperialistic Europe, with an eye to the entire European cultural history, from Shakespeare to Thomas Aquinas, from Dante to Homer.

However, its first publication was not the 1000 copy edition published in Paris on February 2, 1922, nor was it published in Europe at all. The first iteration of *Ulysses* in print appeared serially in a US periodical, *the Little Review*, between 1918 and 1920. Harriet Shaw Weaver, editor of the *Egoist* in London (and the publisher of the serialized *A Portrait of the Artist* 1914-15), could not find a printer willing to risk serializing *Ulysses* in England. Ezra Pound helped to find Margaret Anderson’s *Little Review* as a publisher, and Joyce agreed that he would be prepared to “consign it serially from 1 January next, instalments of about 6000 words” (SL, 227). *Ulysses* began to appear serially in *Little Review* in March 1918, and managed 23 instalments publishing 13 chapters, whereas the *Egoist* managed only three chapters in 1919. It was the issue of July-August 1920, the third instalment of chapter 13, ‘Nausicaa’, depicting Leopold Bloom’s onanism on Sandymount Strand, that brought the serialization of the book to a halt. John Sumner, Secretary of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, successfully prosecuted the *Little Review* editors Anderson and Jane Heap on the grounds of obscenity, which effectively ended the serialization of *Ulysses*.

This first published text of *Ulysses* was very different from the legendary Shakespeare and Company publication of 1922, not only because it represented less than 14 episodes of 18, but also because the episodes that were serialized comprised 5-40% less textual material. Also, in the serialized form the Homeric context was more visible with the chapter titles, such as ‘Telemachus’ and ‘Nestor’, than it was in the Shakespeare and Company edition, where the Homeric titles, save for the title of the book itself, were removed.

The next manifestation of *Ulysses* was the 1922 Shakespeare and Company edition published by Sylvia Beach, and printed by Maurice Darantiere in Dijon, with its 732 pages, no chapter titles, and the publisher’s apology in the beginning, stating...

---

12 See Clare Hutton’s book *Serial Encounters: Ulysses and the Little Review* for textual criticism on the serialization of Ulysses: “Though the Little Review managed to publish twenty-three instalments of Ulysses in sequence, the process of publication in New York was fraught with difficulty. Trouble began in January 1919 with the issue containing the first instalment of chapter 8 (‘Lestrygonians’)” (Hutton 2019, 7).

13 The first three first episodes from ‘Telemachus’ to ‘Proteus’ were increased only 4-5% from 1919 to 1922, but episode 5, ‘Lotus-Eaters’, for instance, was expanded by 41% (Hutton 2019, 139).
“The publisher asks the reader’s indulgence for typographical errors unavoidable in the exceptional circumstances” (Joyce 1998, 1). Copies of the forbidden book were clandestinely delivered to the UK and the US and were mostly destroyed by customs officers. In 1932 Odyssey Press was set up specifically to publish a corrected text of *Ulysses* on the continent, after retaining the rights from Sylvia Beach. Before this, in 1926, Samuel Roth began to print the book in instalments in the US without authorization.

It is noteworthy that *Ulysses* materialized in authorized translations in German (1927) and French (1929), and as unauthorized translations in Czech (1930) and in two Japanese editions (1931, 1932) before it could legally exist in English in the UK or the US. In 1932 the matter was brought to judicial decision in the US, as, in a stratagem devised by Morris L. Ernst, a copy of the book was apparently wilfully delivered to the New York Customs officers for suppressing. This brought about the famous legal case *United States v. One Book Called “Ulysses”*. The case was heard by Justice John M. Woolsey in 1933. After Woolsey’s verdict, on December 6, 1933, that *Ulysses* was “emetic” and not “aphrodisiac”, and may therefore be admitted into the United States, Random House hurried their edition into print. In 1934 the Random House *Ulysses* appeared, with Woolsey’s ruling at the head of the edition as a legal strategy to hedge against future attempts to prosecute the book. It was 768 pages long, and contained the gigantic initials “S”, “M”, and “P”, presumably for the main characters Stephen Dedalus, Molly Bloom, and her husband Poldy Bloom, at the beginnings of parts I, II, and III respectively. It is the third possible source text of the book.

The other half of the English-speaking world finally surrendered to *Ulysses* in 1936, when Bodley Head published the book in the UK in 1936 as a limited edition, followed by a popular edition the next year. This lean edition of 704 pages, with only the numerals I, II, and III between the parts and without even page breaks, not to mention titles or numbers, between the episodes, is still a very popular source text of *Ulysses* and is even the foundation of the current Penguin Books *Ulysses* editions. We

---

15 In a very interesting article in *The New York Review of Books*, Michael Chambon (2019) writes about the famous court case as a successfully manipulated “test drive” by Bennett Cerf, publisher and cofounder of Random House, and Morris Ernst, general counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union.
have now four possible source texts\textsuperscript{16} for \textit{Ulysses} in the author’s lifetime, but the “Scandal of Ulysses” did not end there.

As an answer to the lack of a single authoritative text of \textit{Ulysses}, Hans Walter Gabler produced a critical and synoptic edition of the book in 1984 – a “corrected text” edition of \textit{Ulysses}, followed by a reading text edition in 1986. Gabler, Professor of English at the University of Munich, with two graduate students, Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior, and a group of Joyce commentators from the UK and the US, laid claim to having produced a definitive edition of \textit{Ulysses} and having corrected over 5,000 errors.\textsuperscript{17} However, Gabler’s edition was soon challenged, first and foremost by John Kidd in his article “The Scandal of Ulysses”,\textsuperscript{18} who claimed Gabler’s team had over-corrected hundreds of formulations that had appeared in previous editions that Joyce had proof-read and approved. What follows from the scandal is that no definitive text of \textit{Ulysses} still exists, and Gabler’s edition may be added as the fifth candidate to the list of potential \textit{Ulysses} source texts.\textsuperscript{19} I consider the question of the source texts of the Finnish and Swedish \textit{Ulysses} translations in chapter 3, “Modulations of voice and translation of texts”.

The second challenge \textit{Ulysses} poses to the simplified conception of the translation process is the question of the target audience of the source text and target text. We assume that the source text target reader and the target reader of the translated text are quite different, separated by language, time, and culture. This is both the \textit{raison d’être} and the foundational challenge of the phenomenon of translation. But what was the original target audience of \textit{Ulysses}?\textsuperscript{20}

First, if we accept that there are at least five source texts, there must be five target audiences. The readers of the serialized \textit{Ulysses} of \textit{The Little Review} in the US and


\textsuperscript{17} “[T]his reading text for Ulysses is thus, as nearly as editorial skill and critical understanding have been able to render it, a non-corrupted counterpart to the first edition of 1922” (Gabler 1986, 649-50).


\textsuperscript{19} Gabler’s edition generated controversy mostly due to its stated and possibly misunderstood editorial strategy that proclaimed: “[T]he material indeterminacy of texts, the logical impossibility of definitive editions, the involvement of readers as well as editors in the process of texts, the centrality of textuality scholarship to the enterprise of criticism” (Gabler 1993, 248).
The Egoist in the UK would have been at the forefront of the Anglo-American modernist avant-garde, represented by editors Margaret Anderson and Harriet Shaw Weaver, and enthusiastic propagators Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot. The first readers of the manuscripts in Trieste and Zürich, and the target audience of the Shakespeare and Company *Ulysses* of 1922, were a polyglot and multicultural marginal society thrown together by socio-cultural and historical circumstance.\(^{20}\) Since the Shakespeare and Company first edition was preordered, we know quite specifically the first audience: André Gide, T. E. Lawrence, W. B. Yeats, Ernest Hemingway, etc.\(^{21}\) Legendary New York pornographer Samuel Roth’s pirated *Ulysses*, which he began to publish in 1926, was aimed at aficionados of risqué literature, but the Random House and Bodley Head editions then reclaimed Joyce for the general English-speaking audience.

The audience of Gabler’s 1984 synoptic edition was naturally an international élite readership of Joyce amateurs and scholars, and the following 1986 reading text has after complications come to be accepted as the closest thing to an authoritative text we have. Joyce scholar Fritz Senn has noted that due to the extraordinary writing process of *Ulysses*, which took place first in voluntary exile in Trieste, then in the forced exile of World War I, and ended up in Paris and, it might be added, due to its extra-ordinary publication history, there is no native reader of *Ulysses*: “There is no reader of *Ulysses* for whom some passages are not, literally, foreign and for whom many have not remained unfamiliar for a long time” (Senn 1984, 45). *Ulysses* is a foreigner wherever it goes. Can it then be translated and domesticated as a native of a new land and language? If there is no native reader of the source text, who should the target text be aimed at? I discuss the question of the target audience of the Finnish and Swedish *Ulysses* translations in chapter 3.

The third question that *Ulysses* poses with regard to the above-mentioned simple schema of translation is the question of source text author and language. Even though,

\(^{20}\) Fritz Senn lists some of the factual early target readers: “The roll call of early perceptive foreign readers includes Italo Svevo, Stefan Zweig, Valery Larbaud, Louis Gillet, Ernst Robert Curtius, Carola Giedion-Welcker, Bernhard Fehr, Hermann Broch, et al(ieni) and is proportionally impressive, especially in an early stage; that is, before Americans reclaimed him for the English-speaking world” (Senn 1984, 40).

\(^{21}\) Sylvia Beach lists the names of many preorderers in her memoir *Shakespeare and Company* of 1959. She also notes that even though G. B. Shaw never ordered the book, and even said no older Irish gentleman would ever pay the price of 150 francs for it, there were also orders of the book from Ireland (Beach 1959, 63–66).
in practical terms, the language of *Ulysses* is English and the author James Joyce, the book calls into question the narratorial voice and authorial originality to such an extent that the translator may be permitted to ask whose words she is translating?

From its very title, *Ulysses* is an intertextual book, re-writing classical material in a modern way. *Ulysses* rewrites and recirculates old myth, classical philosophy, Catholic theology, but also alludes to a more popular tradition of questionable value, such as “Aristotle’s” *Masterpiece*, a work that poses as classical text by a canonical author, but is in fact a 17th-century sex manual by an unknown author. *Ulysses* exposes the fabric of which a modern person’s consciousness is composed: there is pan-European mythology as well as nationalistic propaganda; there is (incorrectly remembered) science as well as religious beliefs (of many denominations); there is Shakespeare and Dante as well as low-brow adult entertainment; there is Wagner as well as popular ditties of the time.

1.3. Parody, pastiche, intermediality

In this comparative study I analyse the hermeneutic situations of a literary work and its translation(s) in their linguistic and historical contexts. This means that I need to study both the context of the source text, the conversation in which it partakes, and the context of the target text, the literary and aesthetic situation that it enters. This requires a two-pronged approach, the study of translation of intertextuality (how the original work rewrites, ties itself to, and takes distance from, its own literary predecessors) and translation as intertextuality (translation as re-creation, version, imitation, or even parody).

Indeed, *Ulysses* often parodies the texts it rewrites: In a modern rewriting of Homer’s *Odyssey* it is striking that the modern Dublin counterpart for the ancient heroic sailor and adventurer has never ventured farther than Holyhead,\(^{22}\) is seduced by - instead of mythical Sirens - quite ordinary Hotel Ormond barmaids, and fights - instead of a gigantic cyclops with a burning spear - with a one-eyed nationalist wielding a burning cigar. The modern Penelope, Molly Bloom, demonstrably does not remain

\(^{22}\) “A longcherished plan he meant to one day realise some Wednesday or Saturday of travelling to London via long sea not to say that he had ever travelled extensively to any great extent but he was at heart a born adventurer though by a trick of fate he had consistently remained a landlubber except you call going to Holyhead which was his longest” (JJU, 512).
faithful, and whereas Homer’s Telemachus, son of Odysseus, meets Nestor, King of Pylos, and a famous horseman, Joyce’s Stephen Dedalus talks to headmaster Deasy about foot and mouth disease. Yet Joyce’s attitude towards the old models is not simply benevolent, nor is his attitude toward the modern world simply disparaging: Unlike his ancient counterpart, Leopold Bloom does not sack cities and destroy races\textsuperscript{23} on his travels, nor does he massacre his wife’s suitors when he returns home.

I argue, following Simon Dentith,\textsuperscript{24} that parody is a stance adopted toward an earlier, imitated text, rather than a form or a genre. Parody is marked imitation with a marked difference, and it can be adopted with a range of attitudes ranging from ludic irony towards the parodied text to satire towards society. Parody is an explicitly polyphonic practice, and therefore it warrants attention in a study of polyphonic translation. I analyse the Finnish and Swedish translations of parody in James Joyce’s *Ulysses* in chapter 4, “Jawbreakers about phenomenon”. Parody is present throughout *Ulysses*, but it abounds in episode twelve of the book, ‘Cyclops’, where the narration of the episode is interrupted approximately thirty times by imitations of gigantic, hyperbolic or pompous text styles, such as the style of a “legal document”, “medieval romance”, or a “newspaper puff”. I will therefore limit my analysis of translating parody to examples of that episode, and consider the recognition and signs of parody, the question of form versus content, and the question of the “distance” between the parodying text and the parodied text.

Pastiche, or stylistic imitation, is often seen as the more serious counterpart of parody. Parody is seen as imitation with a difference or with a critical edge, whereas pastiche is seen as ‘slavish’ or even ‘unintended’ imitation of past forms and styles.\textsuperscript{25} This is not, however, what pastiche on closer inspection proves to be. Pastiche is also imitation with a difference, with a distance, and very often not without critique and humour. I follow Sanna Nyqvist\textsuperscript{26} in defining pastiche as a complicated, transformative, and ambivalent imitative practice, and one that exists in two traditions: the tradition of *stylistic pastiche* and *compilation pastiche*. What separates pastiche from parody in my

---

\textsuperscript{23} As Odysseus does in the land of the Cicones, in Book IX of Homer’s *Odyssey*.
\textsuperscript{24} See Dentith on parody as cultural practice (Dentith 2000, 9).
\textsuperscript{26} See Nyqvist on the two separate traditions of pastiche in her 2010 study *Double-Edged Imitation: Theories and Practices of Pastiche in Literature*, 124-127.
view is the particular (recognized or recognizable) target author or text in the case of *stylistic pastiche*, and the patchwork of a series of imitations from a tradition in the case of *compilation pastiche*.

Both of these senses of pastiche are found in *Ulysses* in episode fourteen, ‘Oxen of the Sun’. The chapter employs the technique of, as reported by the Gilbert (1955, 30) schema, “embryonic development”, in which the theme of a maternity hospital, reproduction, and “sterilizing the act of coition”, is depicted by an uninterrupted progression of the development of English prose style from Ælfric to Bunyan, and from Swift to Dickens. The progression of the *stylistic pastiches* creates an overarching *compilation pastiche* episode. The result is an episode which is infamously difficult to translate, as it is a fabric woven from a tradition which is instantly recognizable for a well-read English-speaker such as Joyce himself, but necessarily to a degree foreign to a reader from another language area or, indeed, for a modern English reader removed from the canon of Joyce’s day. Finnish and Swedish translations of the pastiches in the ‘Oxen of the Sun’ episode are therefore an obvious choice for polyphonic translation analysis, which is offered in chapter 5, “A pregnant word”.

For chapter 5, and the analysis of translating pastiche, I have created a digital *Oxen of the Sun hypertext* (OSH). On the website, the text of chapter 14 of *Ulysses* is divided into 30 major pastiche passages. In the text there are tags which operate as links. The links lead to the texts being imitated in the passage. There are larger excerpts which operate as links to the Finnish and Swedish translations of the passages. Those open up to pages with four translations of the respective excerpts, two Swedish and two Finnish, and I offer my own backtranslations into English. On the translations page, there are corresponding tags as in the original passage, allowing for comparison whether the allusions have been conveyed into new languages and to audiences. The novel and experimental digital companion site for chapter 5 of my dissertation allows

---

27 Fritz Senn writes about Joyce’s specific allusions in *Ulysses*, tightly interlaced with the whole surrounding texture, in his essay “Translation as Approach”, originally published in 1969: “There are, for example, no real and adequate equivalents to the literary styles whose progression makes up the Oxen of the Sun chapter. And still less can the styles of individual and highly characteristic writers be parodied” (Senn 1984, 19).

28 Due to copyright restrictions, the *Oxen of the Sun hypertext* is available on a private site that requires registration. The *Oxen of the Sun hypertext* is built on a WordPress platform. In order to access the site, you need to register a WordPress account at www.wordpress.com. After registering, go to https://oxenofthesunhypertext.wordpress.com/ and the page will prompt you to ‘request an invite’. After sending your request, you will soon receive permission to enter the site with your WordPress account.
for more extensive examples from the episode than could be fitted into the dissertation proper, and it allows an English-speaking reader of the dissertation to examine the traces of imitative practice in the Finnish and Swedish translations. Pastiche cannot be reduced to lexical or syntactic traits, quotation or allusion, and therefore the OSH cannot offer us quantitative evidence of, say, how frequently the target texts convey allusions in source texts, but it may offer an opportunity for my readers to qualitatively and comparatively weigh the evidence of my analysis.

The foreign voices humming in the background of *Ulysses* are not only textual and spoken language, but also, very often, music. From the very first episode, the characters sing or listen to music, or hum tunes and song lyrics in their minds. This technique culminates in episode eleven, ‘Sirens’, where the “art” of the episode is “music” and the “technic” is “fuga per canonem”. In this episode the narration does not simply allude intertextually to song lyrics. Something else happens on the textual level of the episode that is unlike anything the *Ulysses* reader has encountered in the previous episodes: there is a plethora of onomatopoetic noises, word repetitions, the reduction of words into rhythmically repeated, syllabic units, word agglutinations, and combinations of letters with no lexical meaning. All of this amounts to a text that appears to be governed by acoustics, not syntactics. In fact, it has become a commonplace to say that in the ‘Sirens’ Joyce attempts or even succeeds in blurring the line between literature and music, that he translates music into literature, or that he adapts music into literature. I analyse the Finnish and Swedish translations of the musico-literary narration in the ‘Sirens’ episode of *Ulysses* in chapter 6, “A Voiceless song sang from within”.

---

29 See Kristina Lindgren (1991, 38) on the French translations of *Ulysses*: “In other words, Joyce wanted to depict human speech or noise (the two are often mixed) by using certain combination of letters, which have no lexical meaning, without trying to imitate the quality of the sound through conventional onomatopoetic means. Here we can note Joyce’s preference for certain orthographic signs, for k in particular.”

30 A view held e.g. by Zimmerman (2002, 117): “By translating a fuga per canonem into prose, Joyce is able to appropriate music’s capacity for simultaneous development and thus to offer a new approach to literary narrative.”

31 Cf. Gilbert (1955, 242): “This résumé of the musical proclivities of the Dubliners in general and of the author of *Ulysses* in particular seemed not unnecessary as an approach to this chapter, the Sirens, which both in structure and in diction goes far beyond all previous experiments in the adaptation of musical technique and timbre to a work of literature.”
In my analysis, I follow Werner Wolf’s typology of three main areas of musicalization of fiction, or what he calls “covert musical presence in literature” (1999, 41): 1) thematization or ‘telling’, 2) evocation or ‘quotation of song lyrics’, and 3) imitation or ‘showing’. My analysis suggests that the mode of thematization of music in the ‘Sirens’ poses questions of recognition and signs or markers, not unlike the questions posed by parody concerning translation. The problematics in the mode of evocation resemble those of translating pastiche, where a minor allusion stands metonymically for a great tradition. Finally, the question of imitation of music in prose narration resembles the special problematics of translating poetry.  

In the following chapter 2, “Never know whose thoughts you’re chewing”, I present the theoretical background of my study, and the Polyphonic Translation Model (PTM), which I developed for the purposes of this study, a comparative literature thesis on the (re)translations of Joyce’s intertextual prose in Ulysses. The theoretical tradition of intertextuality underlying the PTM begins with the dialogic utterance, and the polyphonic novel of Mikhail Bakhtin, and Julia Kristeva’s notion of intertextuality as a mosaic of quotations. More recently Scarlett Baron has written on Joyce’s intertextuality, which absorbs and entwines foreign linguistic materials. It is this keen sense of tradition, the impossibility of originality, the creation of something original when all one has to work with are used words, forms, and styles, explicated in Ulysses, that motivates this study and the PTM.

In translation theory, this study is rooted in the translation and especially retranslation theories of Antoine Berman, Outi Paloposki, and Kaisa Koskinen. I also take a critical view of some methodological and analogical tools developed on the basis of Berman’s thinking, such as the so-called retranslation hypothesis, proposed by Andrew Chesterman, and the distinction of foreignization and domestication by Lawrence Venuti. The retranslation hypothesis has already been shown not to have strong explanatory power, and the domestication/foreignization dichotomy, drawn

---

32 Antoine Berman applies his theory and methodology for criticism of translation in the second, practical part of his 1995 (2009, 81-199) book, Toward a Translation Criticism, on the translations of poetry, namely Elegy XIX by John Donne, considering the rendering of the intellectual and stylistic aspects of the poem according to the translators’ positions, projects, and horizons. Berman (2009, 176-7) also considers music and rhythm in poetry, with reference of Pasternak and Rilke.

33 See Baron’s 2012 book, ‘Strandentwining Cable’: Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality: “[T]he exceptionally dense and wide-ranging intertextuality of Joyce’s writing, which constantly ‘link[s] back’ to precursor texts, absorbing and entwining the strands of foreign linguistic materials” (Baron 2012, 2).
from Berman’s considerations on the Romantic view of translation as the experience (or struggle with) the foreign, is in its common usage quite simplistic. Instead, I focus on Berman’s concepts of productive criticism of translation, translation as a critical and creative process, and the position, project and horizon of the translator. As I see it, the different projects, the articulated purposes of the translations, form the basis of a dialogue between the translations, and a likely motive for retranslations of a source text into a language in which an earlier translation already exists.

The dialogue between the Finnish and Swedish translations and retranslations of the embedded voices imitated in James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, creates a polyphonic choir in which the significance of the book is negotiated in a complementary conversation, but is also argued over in a hubbub of deconstruction and reconstruction. In chapter 3, “Modulations of voice and translation of texts”, I introduce the two Finnish and two Swedish translations of *Ulysses*, and present a critical examination of their translation projects, the translators’ conceptions of their own translating position, and the driving forces of the translations. I will also study the translation horizon, the literary and cultural horizon in which the translation is received, and the paratextually and contextually reported dialogue of the translators with other translators and critics. As a general claim I assert, on the basis of comments the translators have made on each other’s translations elsewhere, and comments the retranslators made in interviews for this study, that the relationship of the Swedish first translation and retranslation projects is complementary, in the sense that the retranslator compared his translation to the first one, and added aspects to the Swedish *Ulysses* macrotext that had been lost in the first translation project. As for the Finnish translation and retranslation projects, I would argue the translations are antithetical, in the sense that the retranslator set out on an explicitly different translation project than the first Finnish re-creation of Joyce’s work, but also because the retranslator made his translation literally on top of the first translation “destroying it with the touch of the original” (Lehto, interview). There are instances of dialogue between the first Finnish translation and the preceding first Swedish translation, less so between the Finnish retranslation and the Swedish first translation, and no tangible evidence of dialogue between the Swedish retranslation and Finnish first translation.
Intertextuality is omnipresent throughout *Ulysses*, starting with the title, which is of course an allusion, in a Latinate form, to an ancient Greek mythical traveller, and an entire mythical tradition. The very first episode of the first part of the book, the “Telemachia”, focusing on Stephen Dedalus, a young writer who has returned to Dublin from Paris, and who is haunted by images of his dead mother, begins with a mockery of a Catholic sermon by Buck Mulligan. Buck Mulligan – as it turns out – a disloyal friend of young Stephen, is an agent of polyphonic utterance, putting on one feigned voice and character after another. The first words spoken in the book, by Buck Mulligan, are both an imitation of the speech of a priest, but also in a foreign language, namely, Latin.\(^{34}\) In the course of the first episode, Buck Mulligan imitates the voices of, among others, a Priest at a Mass, an art connoisseur admiring a nose rag, and old mother Grogan pouring tea. The third episode, ‘Proteus’, of the first part, depicting the inner monologue of Stephen Dedalus, is dense with allusions. Similarly, in the first sentences, “Ineluctable modality of the visible: at least that if no more, thought through my eyes. Signatures of all things I am here to read, seaspawn and seawrack, the nearing tide, that rusty boot. Snotgreen, bluesilver, rust: coloured signs” (*JJU*, 31) we have allusions to Aristotle, Jakob Boehme, and George Berkeley.\(^{35}\)

In the second part, the “Odyssey”, the narration is focused on Leopold Bloom, a Dublin advertisement canvasser of Hungarian Jewish descent, the universal everyman who wanders the streets of the city for the day of the book, June 16, 1904. At the end of the book we have the testimony of “Poldy’s” wife “Molly” Bloom that her husband is “always imitating everybody” (*JJU*, 634). Homer’s Odysseus was *polytropos*, a wily man, or “a man capable of turning many ways”, but Joyce’s Ulysses, Mr Bloom, is an empathetic man, sensitive to others’ thoughts and expressions.\(^{36}\) Correspondingly, in the second part of the book, from which the material in the analysis chapters of my study is chosen, the narration turns many ways, sensitively echoing the themes and contents of the episode. In addition to the above-mentioned episodes imitating music (episode 11), parodying lofty literary styles (episode 12), and

\(^{34}\) It is, in fact, an explicit quotation from the Catholic Mass: “It would be hard to determine exactly where Buck Mulligan drops all of his guises and pretenses and speaks in his own voice, if he ever does” (Senn 1984, 125).

\(^{35}\) Don Gifford & Robert J. Seidman site in their *Ulysses Annotated* (1988, 44-45) the sources as Aristotle’s *Sense and the Sensible*, Boehme’s *Forty Questions of the Soul*, and Berkeley’s *An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision*.

\(^{36}\) Joyce reportedly used the Butcher and Lang translation of the Odyssey, which rather surprisingly “renders the first epithet as ‘the man, so ready at need’” (Senn 1984, 130).
imitating the development of English prose style (episode 14), there is episode 7, ‘Aeolus’, imitating extensively the rhetorical devices of sensationalist newspaper articles and episode 13, ‘Nausicaa’, narrated half-way in a tumescent style echoing romance magazines and novelettes before, after the climax, the narration turns into a detumescent interior monologue of Mr Bloom.

The third part, the “Nostos”, ends with episode 18, ‘Penelope’, and with the voice of Mr Bloom’s wife, and Joyce’s Penelope, singer Marion Bloom. Penelope’s famous unpunctuated flow of inner monologue is on the one hand an imitation of the unpunctuated letters Nora Joyce sent her husband James, but there are also more general quotations of, especially, lyrics to songs such as “O sweetheart May”, “Molly darling”, and of course “loves sweet soooooooooong”.

Earlier episodes in the last part of the book are heavily intertextual as well: Episode 16, ‘Eumaeus’, systematically employs the grammatical errors listed in Lindley Murray’s English Grammar, in a similar, but antithetical, way as the earlier ‘Aeolus’ episode employed classical rhetorical figures. Episode 17, ‘Ithaca’, employs the question-and-answer structure of the catechism.

Examples of intertextual allusions, pastiches and parodies can be drawn from anywhere in Ulysses, and in chapter 2 I analyse some passages from different parts of the book, but for an in-depth analysis of the chosen phenomena, and their translations, I focus on the three aforementioned episodes, with the most explicit and extensive intertextual strategies.

James Joyce’s Ulysses is a book about the complexity and divinity of everyday life. The narration alludes indiscriminately to medieval philosophy and ladies’ pictorials without explanation or explication. Ulysses is simultaneously extremely local, set in a specific time and place at the beginning of the 20th century and at the far corner of Europe, and absolutely universal, covering through allusions the stories, characters, and thinking of previous historical periods, and travelling in thoughts and words to Gibraltar, Szombathely, and Jaffa.

Ulysses is a work which should be impossible to translate, but also, it seems, as Ulysses is to some extent foreign to each one of its readers, it is a work which needs to

---

be translated to be understood. Ulysses is therefore the work which can help us understand how the translation of intertextual material, the imitation of imitation, is possible, but also translation is the phenomenon through which we can make, and have made, important discoveries about Ulysses.

In discussing the translation aesthetics of Friedrich Schleiermacher, Antoine Berman argues that for the philosopher and translator, who could be considered the founder of modern hermeneutics, authentic translation must be a massive process, a transplantation and appropriation of what is foreign:

[T]ranslation of several languages, several literatures, multiple translation of the same work, to be sure, along the indicated path, able to complement each other reciprocally, to give rise to confrontations, discussions, etc. Translation on a large scale is in fact the constitution of a field of translation in the linguistic and literary space.
Berman 1992, 151 (italics in the original)

It is this polyglot field in which James Joyce’s Ulysses exists in its Finnish and Swedish translations and retranslations, the confrontation of the original’s intertextual relations with the new cultural and literary horizon into which it is transplanted, and the polyphonic hermeneutic discussion of translations and criticism that is created, that is my focus in the present study. In the following chapter I introduce the theoretical and methodological background of this comparative literary study of (re)translations as (productive) literary criticism and generalize my view of the polyphony of (re)translation as the Polyphonic Translation Model (PTM). In addition to the literary studies background of Bakhtin, Kristeva, and Genette, I converse, in addition to Berman and Benjamin, with Riitta Oittinen’s writings on Bakhtinian dialogism in translation, Alvstad’s, Greenall’s, Jansen’s and Taivalkoski-Shilov’s notion of voices in

38 There are numerous formulations of the question whether Ulysses can be translated. This is Fritz Senn’s: “If we had such a conception and could agree on it we would be prepared to answer the ultimate question of whether Ulysses can be translated at all. Joyce himself said that only the original was authentic, but then he also helped and encouraged translations” (Senn 1984, 1). In a similar vein, there are of course convincing arguments stating that all translation is impossible, among them Bakhtin’s, in a passage from Problema teksta v lingvistike, filologii i drugikh gumanitarnykh naukakh (“The problem of text in linguistics, philology, and the other human sciences”) quoted and translated by Todorov (1984, 26): “Every system of signs (that is, every ‘language’), no matter how limited the collectivity that adopts it by convention, can always be, in principle, deciphered, that is translated into other sign systems (other languages); therefore, there exists a general logic of sign systems, a language of languages, potential and unified (obviously it can never become a particular concrete language, a language among others). But a text (as distinct from language as a system of means) can never be fully translated, because there is no text of texts, potential and unified.”
translation, and Paloposki’s and Koskinen’s studies on retranslation, from the field of translation studies. Borrowing these ideas from translation studies, I present a polyphonic view of translated literature in general, and of the Finnish/Swedish Ulysses in particular, that, in addition to comparative literature studies, may hopefully prove useful and be further developed by translation scholars.
2.

“Never know whose thoughts you’re chewing”

The Polyphonic Translation Model

In this chapter I present my Polyphonic Translation Model, an intertextual model for the comparative literary study of (re)translations of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*. The polyphonic model brings together sets of theories from different areas of research:

1) from comparative literature and semiotics, the poststructural understanding of polyphony and intertextuality in the line of Bakhtin, Kristeva, and Barthes,

2) from modern translation studies, the discussion of textual and contextual voices in translation by researchers such as Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov and Kristina Solum, and

3) the productive criticism of (re)translation by Antoine Berman, and a collection of discussions by different scholars, which Siobhan Brownlie (2006, 150) has called Retranslation Theory.

Before bringing these sets of theories together, I engage in a theoretical discussion on the polyphonic nature of writing and the polyphonic nature of the afterlife of literature in translation. I argue that literary translation is polyphonic co-creation and re-creation. This is in concordance with the view of translation as a plural process, as Antoine Berman sees it, in which all the translations into a given language, and even, to an extent, all the translations in all languages take part. This refers back to Walter Benjamin’s (2009, 31) concept of translatability as the essence of certain works, which Berman (1992, 126) specifies as literacy translatability (and untranslatability), in which the native strangeness of the work is joined by its strangeness in the foreign language. It is the untranslatable in a work, oeuvre, and language, which calls for translation, makes translation a necessary hermeneutic and creative process, and motivates successive translations to carve translation paths to transpose a work in its strangeness and in its foreignness into a new cultural and literary horizon. In the
discussion I consider the Bermanian notions of the position, process, and horizon of the translations, and consider the polyphonic Swedish-Finnish *Ulysses* macrotext they create.

The idea of the dialogic nature of the utterance and the polyphonic novel originates in the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin. For Bakhtin, language is always communicative; an utterance does not “belong” monologically to the speaker or the writer of the text. The central focus in Bakhtin’s philosophy is on utterance (*slovo*). In describing Dostoevsky’s utterance in his 1929 study *Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo* (English translation, 1984 *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*), when analysing the dialogic nature of Dostoevsky’s discourse, Bakhtin stresses the fact that even the smallest signifying particle of a text is in itself inescapably dialogic. It is not a single, one-directional referential signifier from subject to object, but it is a unidirectional poetic double. The word is understood in communication, and in a specific historical and cultural context.

A parallel concept for ‘dialogic discourse’ for Bakhtin is ‘another’s word’ (*cužoje slovo*). No word belongs to either the sender or the receiver, but rather language is constructed of borrowed words. Language is internally dialogic discourse: in every element of discourse there are two consciousnesses, two points of view, two evaluations, two voices constantly interrupting one another (Bakhtin 1984, 211). Another view is that a word belongs to everyone; anyone has a chance to add his or her own comment and voice into the polyphonic choir of the word. The social and cultural context to which a word is inescapably adherent makes the word a social and political battlefield:

> Within the arena of almost every utterance an intense interaction and struggle between one’s own and another’s word is being waged, a process in which they oppose or dialogically interanimate each other. The utterance so conceived is a considerably more complex and dynamic organism than it appears when construed simply as a thing that articulates the intention of the person uttering it, which is to see the utterance as a direct, single-voiced vehicle for expression. 
Bakhtin 1981a, 354-5

Dialogism, the construal of dialogue, marks the existential condition of humanity. Unlike Hegelian dialectics, Bakhtin’s dialogism is infinitely polyphonic, *unfinalizeable*. My purpose in this chapter is to present a Bakhtinian model of polyphonic
Bakhtin’s concepts of dialogism and carnivalism have been applied to translation by Finnish translator and translation scholar Riitta Oittinen. She introduced Bakhtinian ideas into the study of especially, but not limited to, translating for children in the 1990s. Oittinen criticized previous translation theories for concentrating on a supposed dichotomy of either fidelity to the source text (the original author) or adaptation to the target culture (the reader of the translation). Oittinen emphasizes, on the basis of Bakthin’s literary theories, the active role of the reader in the dialogic process of meaning, and, in this case, concentrating on the active agency of the translator: “Translations can also be understood as words directed toward an answer, a new text, and a new reader; and they cannot escape the profound influence of the answering word that they anticipate” (Oittinen 1989, 32). This highlights the independence of translation as a text and as a communicative situation. Translations cannot “convey” the source text and need not strive for equivalence. A text is given new meaning with every new translation, and the translation is given new meaning with every new reading.

Oittinen sees translation, understood as transformation and rewriting, as a liberating “carnival freedom” for the translator from the authoritative utterance of the source text: “Carnivalistic speech is not official, nor authoritarian, but internally persuasive, dialogic discourse, where every word consists of the ‘I’ and the ‘you’” (Oittinen 1989, 35). In her 1995 book in Finnish, Kääntäjän karnevaali (“Translator’s carnival”), Oittinen describes translation as a carnivalesque positive manipulation, a context-specific dialogue, in which the translator does not strive toward equivalence but toward the communication context of the target language readers.” In emphasizing the communicative situation and function of the target text, Oittinen refers to the functional translation theories, prevalent in the 1980s and ’90s, of Katharina Reiss, Hans J. Vermeer, and Christiane Nord.  

39 “Kääntäminen uudelleenkirjoittamisena, myönteisenä manipulaatiiona, erilaisissa tilanteissa tapahtuvana dialogina merkitsee tekstien karnevalisointia, jolloin kääntäjä ei pyrkäisi samanteen vaan kurottaa sanansa tulevia kohdekielisiä lukijoita kohti” (Oittinen 1995, 146).
Functionalist approaches to translation theory are what might be called a trend or a viewpoint on translation, rather than a school or an organized methodology. What is central in the functionalist approaches is that they make no definite normative evaluations on what is a ‘correct’ equivalent between a source text and target text. However, evaluations can be made between the target text and its own context and function, the adequacy of a translation. Target texts cannot be evaluated on the basis of their equivalency to the source text, but their adequacy to their own purpose, what Reiss and Vermeer call skopos. A translation does not necessarily differ from an adaptation; a translation is an information offer based on an information offer.

Oittinen also refers to Christiane Nord’s translation-oriented text analysis, according to which a translator must analyse the function of the source text: for whom is it written? by whom? and why? Nord’s (2007, 119) contribution to functional translation theories is to introduce “the notion of loyalty into functionalism”. In Nord’s (2007, 125) function-plus-loyalty approach she adds to the pragmatic, culture and target text oriented functionalist approach the aspect of loyalty, the “responsibility translators have toward their partners in translational interaction”. That is to say, the translator must take into account the intentions of the source text and its sender, and also the target readers with their expectations. The skopos theory has not, however, become a major paradigm especially in the study of literary translation.

Oittinen’s book on Bakhtinian translation raises an interesting question: the unique perspective and position or, in Bakhtinian terms, excess of vision, of the translator. An utterance is fulfilled in the interpretation, and this means that meaning does not belong to the author, even though traditionally translations have been seen as subservient to the “original texts”. Kaisa Koskinen has written about the visibility and role of the literary translator in her Licentiate thesis The Invisible Hand (1994, 31), based on the thinking of Derrida, Bakhtin, and Foucault: “A dialogical notion of translation has to be based on appreciating any translator’s unique position or excess

---

41 E.g., Catford’s linguistic definition of ‘translation’: “the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent material in another language (TL)” (Catford 1965, 20).
of vision, just as well as on the translator’s attempts to capture the source text’s vision.” In literary translation, traditionally, the author has occupied a symbolic position of power and authority, which translators have been denied.

In his article “What kind of literature is a literary translation?”, Douglas Robinson has discussed literary translation from another perspective: as a unique literary genre. Robinson (2017, 440–459) explores whether literary translation would fit Gérard Genette’s model of literariness, found in his Fiction and Diction (1993, 21-2). The three prongs of Robinson’s argument are:

“(a) a literary translation is a different kind of literature from an original, because (b) what the literary translator imitates is not just the source text but the source author’s strategies in creating the source text, in particular the novelist’s strategy of presenting a fictional narrative written by him/herself as a true story written by someone else, so that (c) a literary translation creates the illusion of being the source text, written by the source author”.

Robinson 2017, 441 (italics in the original)

For Robinson, it seems, what separates the imitation of translation from the imitation of an intertextual adaptation is the level of pretension: does the writer of the target text pretend to be the author of the source text? When re-writing Homer’s Odyssey, Joyce does not pretend to be Homer. When translating Ulysses, the Finnish and Swedish translators, in different degrees, do pretend to be Joyce, or to convey the message sent by Joyce.

Robinson suggests that literary translation might occupy the empty space in Genette’s (1993, 24) model reserved for “an obviously invented fiction that some readers consider literary and others consider nonliterary” (Robinson 2017, 446). This would place literary translation as a genre in the intertextual field of literature, with the distinction from other rewriting genres such as adaptations that “[a] literary translation creates the illusion of being the source text, written by the source author” (Robinson 2017, 448). This “passing off” as the original, foreign language author, is for Robinson a kind of fictional pretence, not unlike the commonplace of pseudotranslation in early novels.” In this creative reading of Genette, literary translation becomes an imitative genre.

44 Cf. the “found translation framing device” of, e.g., Cervantes’ Don Quixote and Horace Walpole’s The Castle of Otranto.
Below, I explicate my view of the differences and similarities of intertextual adaptations, allusions, and rewritings on the one hand, and literary translation on the other. I will attempt to place literary translation and retranslations in the continuum of intertextual (re)writings. With the use of my Polyphonic Translation Model, I shall answer the question: How does one imitate an imitation? In other words: How does a deeply intertextual source text such as James Joyce’s *Ulysses* exist in another language (pair)? In the analysis chapters that follow, I employ the polyphonic understanding to the study of translations of parody with special reference to episode 12, ‘Cyclops’, of *Ulysses*, in chapter 4; translations of pastiche in episode 14 of the book, ‘Oxen of the Sun, in chapter 5; and, finally, translations of intermedial strategies, namely the musicalization of fiction, in episode 11, ‘Sirens’, in chapter 6.

2.1. The many voices of translated literature

How does one define translation as a Bakhtinian, polyphonic phenomenon? It seems to be easier to define what translation is not, and to speak in paradoxes: translation is not the original words of the original author, carried over to a new language and time, nor is it quite rewriting, a version, or an imitation. Strictly speaking, any literary artwork is merely and exactly the words in which it was written, and therefore translation should, in fact, be impossible, and yet this miracle is performed time and again everywhere in the world.

To take for granted the fact that there is such a thing as translation, and that James Joyce’s *Ulysses* has been translated, and that in Swedish two translations of the work exist and in Finnish, likewise, two, it should be possible to determine some sort of a preliminary proposition or minimal requirement of translation. Translation would seem to be a relationship between two texts, and activity between two languages. This must straightaway be amended by questions of translations made not from the original source text, but by using a mediator text and language: indirect translation. Further, the

45 Consider the aesthetics of American philosopher Nelson Goodman in his *Languages of Art* (1968): Goodman presents the arts and the perception of arts as symbol systems, which denote or otherwise refer to the objects or subjects of the artworks: music, literature, or the visual arts. Goodman evaluates the common notational methods of music, painting, and literary arts. For Goodman (1976, 207-11), the text of a novel is a character in a notational scheme. Works of literature are not compliance-classes of a text but the text or script itself: “The same class as a character in another language is another work, and a translation of a work is not an instance of that work” (Goodman 1976, 209). In literature the work is the character itself.
term translation is often applied not only to transformation between text and languages, but between (art)forms and media.

The term ‘translation’ is sometimes widened to apply even to intra-language transformation. In his “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation”, Roman Jakobson calls this reformulation and rewording intralingual translation.46 Extending the term translation to such cases, however, renders it virtually useless to the field of translation studies in general and the case of the translations of James Joyce’s Ulysses in particular. Antoine Berman (1992, 85), in discussing the thinking of Friedrich Schlegel and Novalis, uses the term generalized translation for “all that concerns the ‘version’ of one thing in terms of another”, and suggests restricted translation as a paradigm for translation between languages. In this dissertation, I study the field of restricted translation of Ulysses into Finnish and Swedish, but it could be considered that if intertextual rewritings, pastiches and parodies, are seen as intralingual reformulations, I also work in the field of generalized translation. For clarity, however, this intertextual field will not be called generalized translation.

Translation is often seen as communication, conveying some information, form, or content from a sender (translator) to a receiver (reader). This raises an objection famously formulated by the German philosopher and literary critic Walter Benjamin. For Benjamin ‘communication’ and ‘aiming at a reader’ were characteristics of a poor translation: “[T]he translation that seeks to communicate could never communicate anything except its being a message – nothing essential, then” (Benjamin 2009, 29). For Benjamin communication is not essential for literary artwork. Why should it then be essential for a translation of such a source text? Benjamin writes of the translatability of a text, which seems to be an unalterable quality, or “essence”.47 Indeed, one commonplace used of difficult translation tasks is that the text is “untranslatable”. This term is often used in a critique of a new translation of a text that was thus far considered “untranslatable”. James Joyce’s Ulysses and Finnegans Wake have certainly at different times and in different language areas been considered untranslatable, until they have been translated and retranslated.

47 “[D]oes the work, in essence, admit of translation and hence (in line with the significance of the form) ask to be translated” (Benjamin 2009, 30).
In Benjamin’s (2009, 33) view, translation is, rather, fit for giving expression to the relationship of languages to one other, and reveals the relatedness of languages. In other words, the languages are related, but the tasks of the writer and the translator are different. For Benjamin translations attempt to draw a multitude of languages together into one true language. This idealistic view is due to the German Romantic context to which Benjamin refers, translations such as Friedrich Hölderlin’s Sophocles translations and Johann Heinrich Voss’ translations of the Iliad and the Odyssey. Benjamin’s reminder of the inherently separate lives of the original and the translation, the source text and the target text, is viable:

For the original, in continuing to exist – that is to say, in its continued existence (which could not be termed such, but for the way in which anything living alters and is renewed) – undergoes a change.

Benjamin 2009, 33-4

The original is never carried across to a new language and culture. It continues its existence, but it is never the same after a new translation.

I call this simultaneous independence and inter-relatedness of source text, target text, and retranslation polyphony in my Polyphonic Translation Model. Similar concepts, emphasizing the active and creative role of the translator, in translation studies have been Theo Hermans’ (1996, 23-48) ‘voice’ of the translator and Hilkka Pekkanen’s (2010, 9-11) ‘duet’ between the author and the translator. Translation, for me, is a critical hermeneutic activity aimed at a specific context, a horizon of expectation, and multivoiced, polyphonic re-creation and co-creation.

Cecilia Alvstad, Annjo K. Greenall, Hanne Jansen, and Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov present the findings of their research project Voices of Translation: Rewriting Literary Texts in a Scandinavian Context, in the book Textual and Contextual Voices of Translation (2017). By voices of translation, they refer both to the voices that appear within the translated text, and the paratextual and contextual voices that surround the reading and reception of the translated text. I use a similar approach in this study regarding the Finnish and Swedish Ulysses translations, researching both the dialogue of the voices forming the source and target texts, and the intertextual voices within the texts. Alvstad et al. (2017, 5) define the notion of ‘voice’ in translation in Bakhtinian terms, as textual identity: “Consequently, ‘voice’ can be defined as the set of textual cues that characterize a subjective or collective identity in a text.” In the
articles both intratextual narrative voices, and imprints of extratextual real-life agents – authors, translators, and proofreaders – within the translated text are considered.

Kristina Solum discusses the influence of contextual voices of literary critics, and the dialogue between them and translators in the public sphere of, for example, literary magazines. Solum (2017, 40) refers to Cecilia Alvstad’s notion of a ‘translation pact’: “According to Alvstad, the translation pact is a rhetorical move in which translations are prepared, in the target context, to be read as though they were originals.” In the case of a confirmed translation pact, a translation is presented by an ‘invisible’ translator, the readers assume they are reading the original source text, conveyed to a new language and culture, and the publication is discussed by critics in the public sphere possibly without even mentioning the translator, the translation process, the publisher, not to mention the proofreaders. Solum’s own examples are from receptions of translations, where the translation pact has been challenged or broken in the public sphere by critics, and where translators have replied to the criticisms by attempting to re-establish the translation pact.” The reception of the Finnish and Swedish Ulysses translations, discussed below in chapter 3, was also largely a case of challenging or attempting to break the translation pact, as the translators and translation processes assumed a central role in the reception of the publications.

The way in which the translator and publisher mediate the text to readers has an influence on how the translation, translator, and author are perceived by the target language readers. Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov and Maarit Koponen (2017, 81-2) discuss the effect contextual and paratextual voices, such as a translator’s preface, a scholarly afterword, or a critical review, may have on the reading of a translated text, in their case the Finnish translation of Foucault’s Histoire de la sexualité: “Is it possible to create a particular reading perspective [...] with the help of paratexts?” In the study, in which the academic background of the participants is also taken into consideration, Taivalkoski-Shilov and Koponen (2017, 84) subject different readers of the same translated text to different paratexts, and investigate through eye-tracking, interviews,

48 Solum (2017, 49) refers to a case in which translator Kyrre Haugen Bakke was criticized by literary critic Bernhard Ellefsen for Anglicisms in his 2012 translation of Jennifer Egan’s A Visit from the Goon Squad (2010): “Bakke’s claims can also be interpreted as an attempt to re-establish the translation pact, that is, to present the translation as though it were a trustworthy rendering of Egan’s original text and not (as maintained by Ellefsen) a badly disfigured version” (Solum 2017, 49).
and reading reports, how the construal of textual meaning is altered: “By paratextual voices we simply mean contextual voices that are deliberately used by the author, the publisher, the translator, critics, readers, or researchers [...] to influence reader reactions to a translated text.” The study suggested that contextual factors do influence the reading perspective, namely the viewpoint or goal of the reader.

In translation studies, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar is a prominent name in paratextual research. According to her article “Paratexts” (2011, 113), the verbal and visual material surrounding published translations, subtitles, prefaces, and epilogues, is increasingly integrated into research of translated texts: “Although paratextual elements are often part and parcel of the translated texts, they also have an independent existence since they stand physically separate from the translated text and are more likely to meet the reader before the translation itself.” Paratexts can be further divided, following Genette (1997b, 5), into peritexts (located in the same volume as the text) and epitexts (at a distance from the text), which can include interviews and letters. For a researcher of translations, paratextual evidence can provide clues as to the target readership, the aim of the translation, and the concept of translation in the target culture, essentially the position, project and horizon of the translation. Especially peritextual evidence has been found to aid in the analysis of translational issues such as authorship and originality, which are difficult to identify in translated texts themselves.

In this thesis, which is also one contextual comment, attempting to influence the view of the Swedish and Finnish translations of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, I discuss the authorial and translatorial paratexts, or lack thereof, in chapter 3 which follows. The first Swedish translation of Thomas Warburton lacks paratexts altogether, save for a blurb on the back cover. The 1993 revised translation brandishes a translator’s afterword on the question of revisions in the new edition. The first Finnish translation by Pentti Saarikoski only offers the paratext of a half-page translator’s word, conveniently filling the space left on the last page of the book after Molly’s final ‘Yes’. The Swedish retranslation adds a foreword and a glossary, while the Finnish retranslation’s extensive use of explanatory footnotes as a paratext needs to be more comprehensively discussed below.
Writing, literature, and translation is a hermeneutic negotiation, a dialogue between an author and a reader. The making of literature is, as Stephen Dedalus aestheticizes in *A Portrait of the Artist* (1996, 238), “the phenomena of artistic conception, artistic gestation and artistic reproduction”. The meaning of the text takes place in the space of negotiation between the sender of the message, the author of the text, and its receiver, the reader. This can be illustrated with a model at first resembling Roman Jakobson’s (1960, 3) sender/receiver model of communication, depicting the literary, or “poetic”, work not as an artefact, but a communicative process which is created between its sender (the writer) and the receiver (the reader):

**Illustration 1**

This model could be enriched for fiction and literature with similar closed brackets as in the Booth-Chatman model with notions of implied author (Booth 1961, 323-336) and intradiegetic or extradiegetic narrator, which in the case of James Joyce and *Ulysses* is certainly an interesting problematic, and will be dealt with later with relation to the sections on pastiche and parody in ‘Oxen of the Sun’ and ‘Cyclops’. Also the question of implied reader (Chatman 1983, 253-262) is of interest for a study on translation, as the change in the addressee of the text is central to the problematic of translation in general, and the specific question of the implied reader of *Ulysses* is something I must address later in my study, but for now it is important to understand the position of a translator in this hermeneutic process:

**Illustration 2**

---

49 In Jakobson’s essay “Linguistics and Poetics”, originally a conference presentation from 1958, he discerns six constitutive factors of communication: sender, context / message / contact / code, and receiver. In fact, in his book on Bakhtin, Todorov (1984, 54) reconstitutes a model of communication from the works of Bakhtin and compares them to Jakobson’s model. In the Todorov/Bakhtin model the factors are speaker, object / utterance / intertext / language, and listener. It would be tempting to use Bakhtin’s terminology in my model, but as the schema drawn up by Todorov appears nowhere as such in Bakhtin’s work, and Jakobson’s functions are more familiar in later research, I shall use Jakobson’s terminology, which was in turn influenced by Karl Ludwig Bühler’s “Organon model” of 1934 (cf. Bühler 2011, 35).
Illustration 2 demonstrates the dual role of the translator in the dialogue of literary translation. The translator acts as the receiver of the source text and the sender of the target text. This is still a far too simplified view of translation, because in this depiction it would seem that the sender of the source text is not at all present in the communicative act of the reception of the target text. If we consider the receptions of the Finnish and Swedish *Ulysses* translations, and, as Taivalkoski-Shilov and Koponen (2017, 81-100) would call them, the paratextual voices surrounding the events of the translations, we notice that James Joyce, the original *Ulysses*, and the earlier translations are very much a part of the context in which and through which a new translation is received.

In the light of this, literary retranslators of source texts such as *Ulysses* are, first of all, reading the source text in a context which contains the original work, the earlier translation(s) to the same target language, and other earlier translations of which they are aware, and in languages they have competence in. Secondly, retranslators are writing a target text, which is received in context through the original source text and its earlier translations in languages which the target text readers have command over. Illustration 3 demonstrates these retranslation contexts.

**Illustration 3**

In this illustration, the retranslator is codified as ‘reader2 / sender3’, which is not to be confused with the earlier translator ‘reader1 / sender2’. The ‘Source Text Context’ that
the retranslator is reading contains the first translation (Text1) through which the translator reads, at least partially, the original source text (Text1).

I anticipate an objection, however: What if, as is quite common, the retranslator tries to avoid the influence of earlier translations, and will not even read the first translation to ensure “an independent” and “original” re-interpretation of the source text? The Finnish and Swedish retranslations of Ulysses are an example that this is not at least always the case: In both the Swedish and the Finnish retranslation of Ulysses the earlier translation has been used, consulted, and “dealt with”, and I would further argue that even in the case of a retranslation process in which the earlier translation is not even opened, there is an implicit image or a “reputation” of the first translation (usually the motivation to undertake the retranslation) that affects the retranslation process and the concrete choices the retranslator makes.

There may be a case of retranslation, of course, in which the retranslator is simply not aware of an earlier translation, possibly due to a great temporal or geopolitical distance. Translation scholar Anthony Pym calls these cases ‘passive retranslations’. In his book Method in Translation History (1998), Pym makes a separation between ‘active retranslation’ and ‘passive retranslation’. In passive retranslation there is no conflict or rivalry between the different translations, and they have little influence on each other. Referring to translations of the fin de siècle period between French and German, Pym defines as active retranslations those translations which share the same cultural location and generation. These translations tend to be in conscious conflict with each other: “Whereas re-edition would tend to reinforce the validity of the previous translation, retranslation strongly challenges that validity, introducing a marked negativity into the relationship at the same time as it affirms the desire to bring a particular text closer” (Pym 1998, 83). In Pym’s view of studying translation history, the study of passive retranslation only tends to provide information about historical change in the target culture, and shows that target culture norms determine translation strategies, whereas the study of active retranslation may give insight into the nature of translation and the workings of translators. Studying the Finnish and Swedish Ulysses translations, I see more elements of what Pym calls active retranslation, as the retranslators are aware of, and take an active stance toward, the first translations, but in the span of sixty-six years there is also certainly an element of the passive retranslation, especially in the Swedish Ulysses translations, as literary
aesthetics, translation aesthetics, and the language itself, has gone through significant change.

As for the Target Text Context, similarly, the target text readers need not even be able to read the original source text or translations in other languages in order for them to influence the reception of the retranslation. The readers may simply have read research literature, reading companions or guides about the original source text, or other paratexts such as reviews about the earlier translated target texts. In the case of the Finnish and Swedish translations of *Ulysses* this is significant: In the space of time between the first translation and the retranslation, the amount of Joyce and *Ulysses* scholarship has exploded, on the one hand, making the source text very different in 2012 than in 1946, for example and, on the other hand, the level of understanding of the English language in both Sweden and Finland has increased radically. The Target Text Context circle must still be amended to account for this. Even though the first translation (Text2) affects the retranslation, looming under the new retranslation target text, the first translator need not be considered an actant in the hermeneutic negotiation of the retranslation. The same may be said of the original author, S1, who influences through Text1 and paratextual evidence, but no longer acts. Instead, especially in the case of *Ulysses*, we must consider the hypotexts of text1, that is those texts the book quotes, alludes to, or imitates. Some obvious hypotexts of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, which all its translators must take into consideration, are its correspondences to Homer’s *Odyssey*, its allusions to the *Bible* and the writings of Thomas Aquinas, but also its parodies of lofty literary styles in the ‘Cyclops’ episode, its pastiches of different stages in the development of English prose style in the ‘Oxen of the Sun’, and its imitations of musical forms and sounds in the ‘Sirens’ episode of the book. Further, the possible hypotexts of the translated target text in the Target Text Context must be accounted for, whether the case be that the original allusion has or has not been conveyed, or that the target text refers to something that was not evoked in the source text.

Below, then, is my complete Polyphonic Translation Model (PTM), an intertextual model for the comparative literary study of (re)translations of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*. The model presents for literary studies an understanding of literary translations of intertextuality (the hypotexts the source text rewrites) and literary
translations as intertextuality (the polyphonic hermeneutic negotiation of the different target texts).

Illustration 4: The Polyphonic Translation Model

The (re)translator, R2/S3, is a critical, hermeneutic reader of the source text and its context, and creative co-author of the target text in its own horizon, the target text context, in which it is received by the active, interpretive consciousness of the readers, R3. Text3, in this understanding, is a continuation of the hermeneutic process of readings from the author to the first translator, to the retranslator, a process, as Antoine Berman writes (1992, 180), “in which our entire relation to the Other [the linguistically, culturally, aesthetically strange] is played out.” The PTM is a model for the comparative study of retranslated literature, which has arisen out of necessity for the analysis of the Finnish and Swedish translations of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, especially the intertextual material of the book, but it is my belief that the model can also be applied to source texts less explicitly intertextually complex than *Ulysses*, and also by a process of elimination to first translations, and the understanding of literary translation in the field of comparative literature in general.

The translator, R2/S3, is translating a source text context which contains the original source text, Text1, under which looms the hypotexts it refers to or rewrites, which in the case of *Ulysses* are at least the *Odyssey*, the *Bible*, Dante, Shakespeare,
and so on. In the source text context, there is also the earlier translation or translations, which have to be addressed, even if they are dealt with by ignoring them. The target text reader, R3, receives the translation in a target text context, which includes the (re)translation, Text3, which is seen, with various degrees of clarity, through the original source text, and possible earlier translation or translations. The reception of the translation is also influenced by (translated) hypotexts of the source text that the reader is familiar with, and other paratexts written on the source text or the earlier target texts: research literature, annotated editions, reading companions, reviews, etc.

A retranslation of a literary work, which is preceded by an earlier translation (or earlier translations) into the same or different languages makes the polyphonic nature of translation explicit. However, there are always at least two voices discernible in even a single first translation, so there is implicit polyphony in all translation.

The PTM also illustrates how a translator translates not only a single source text, but all its hypotexts and paratexts - an entire cultural context - into a new cultural context. Every literary work takes up a tradition, a genre and a conversation, and a translation must not only re-create the comment the work has made on the conversation, but must also implicitly explain the earlier comments that make up the entire conversation.

Illustration 4, the PTM, illustrates specifically the cases of Leevi Lehto’s retranslation of Ulysses into Finnish, and Erik Andersson’s retranslation of Joyce’s work into Swedish. Leevi Lehto’s Ulysses of 2012 (Text3) was preceded by an earlier Finnish translation, Pentti Saarikoski’s Odysseus of 1964 (Text2), and Erik Andersson’s Ulysses of 2012 (Text3) was preceded by Thomas Warburton’s Odysseus of 1946/1993 (Text2). It does not suffice to note that there is dialogue between these four translations and polyphony in all translation. In my study I analyse how these four translations comment and rewrite each other, as well as the original source text, what is the dynamic of translation and retranslation, and what is the macrotext formed by the Finnish and Swedish Ulysses translations.

As a Bakhtinian/Bermanian model, the PTM also works in both directions. From right to left, the retranslation rewrites its predecessor(s), which is a re-creation of the “original”, which in its turn is an implicit or explicit version of its tradition and

Cf. Pekkanen’s (2010, 170) “metaphor of the translator singing in duet with the author”, instead of speaking for, or in the voice of the source writer.
hypotexts. But equally from left to right, as Berman (1992, 184) notes in reference to modern comparative literature of his time, explicitly mentioning the thinking of Bakhtin and Genette, the translation is present in the original: “Any work, as far as one can go back, is already to several degrees a fabric of translations or a creation that has something to do with the translating operation, inasmuch as it posits itself as ‘translatable’”. In Bakhtinian terms, the translation consummates the source text as a work.

In what follows, I will discuss the PTM outlined above first as an intertextual model, and then as a retranslation model.

2.2. Textual relations

In this section my emphasis is on the left side of the PTM: the source text context, containing Text1, and its hypotexts. The question is: As no writing is original (all utterances have been used before by others), and as the forms, formulas and styles used in literature are language, culture, and genre specific, how does a translator or retranslator re-create in a new language and culture not only the source text translated, but the possibly foreign or unknown tradition which that text conforms to or subverts? My premise is that the intertextual nature of writing and the polyphonic process of translation is a key problematic for translation in general, and especially for translations of a densely and explicitly intertextual source text such as Ulysses.

‘Intertextuality’ is a term coined by Julia Kristeva. In Kristeva’s poststructuralist tradition, intertextuality is understood as an all-encompassing nature of all literature and writing, as every writer is always first a reader: a text is never a self-sufficient whole, but a mosaic of quotations.51 The Argentinian writer and critic Jorge Louis Borges voiced a similar view even earlier in a non-academic context, writing in an essay that a book is not an isolated being but “a relationship, an axis of innumerable relationships” (Borges 1964, 248-9).52 In this same tradition is the view of the later, poststructuralist author...

---

51 Cf. Kristeva’s seminal article of 1966, Le mot, le dialogue et le roman (“Word, Dialogue and Novel”): “[A]ny text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double” (Kristeva 1986, 37).

52 In Borges’s view, also, whereas “using others’ words” cannot be avoided, plagiarism is actually impossible. This view is reflected best in his short-story “Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote”
Roland Barthes (1979), for whom a text was a fabric of interwoven quotations, allusions and echoes of other texts.\(^5\)

Other approaches to intertextuality are more pragmatic and technical. Kiril Taranovsky, an Estonian-born scholar of Slavic languages and Russian poetry, studied quotations and allusions - what he came to call 'subtexts' (podteksti) - in Osip Mandelstam’s poetry. For Taranovsky (1976, 1-20), subtexts in Mandelstam’s poetry work as metonymies: a short quotation or allusion is meant to bring the entire subtext into the text and expand its web of meanings. This would certainly be one way of reading *Ulysses*. By alluding to Homer, Dante, the Bible, and most of the important prose writers in English literary history, Joyce certainly seems to be attempting to metonymically conjure up the entire history of English prose and Western cultural history, which would then of course lead up to his *Ulysses*. Using Taranovsky’s understanding of intertextuality though, where the allusion must be read as the *entire* subtext, *Ulysses* would be a gargantuan task to analyse, and to translate.

In structuralist tradition, intertextuality has seemed to incarnate old research questions of tradition and literary influence. In 1982, Gérard Genette published his meticulous taxonomy of what he called *transtextuality*, which includes all the possible interactions between texts. Genette explicitly sets out to create a taxonomy, and states that he is not focusing on questions of hermeneutics, so in his structuralist *transtextuality* some central aspects of Kristeva’s poststructuralist *intertextuality*, namely the emphasis on context and the reader, are side-lined, and intertextual relations are studied as something resembling the study of literary influences in classical poetics. For Genette (1997, 7–10) the term intertextuality means only limited quotation, allusion and plagiarism. Genette calls larger re-writings, transformations, and imitations *hypertextuality*. The strength of Genette’s theory is in meticulous typology, but it differs from my own view of intertextuality, which is more akin to the tradition of Kristeva and Barthes, in that Genette sees intertextuality as a narrower and more historically progressive process, in which, through analysis, the “borrowed” texts may be traced back to their original owners. Genette heavily emphasizes authorial

---

(Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote) from 1939. In the story a fictitious French writer dedicates his life to rewrite parts of Cervantes’s novel word-for-word. Even though the text is identical, we find that the work is different, due to context: “Cervantes’s text and Menard’s are verbally identical, but the second is almost infinitely richer. (More ambiguous, his detractors will say, but ambiguity is richness.)” (Borges 1964, 69).

5 Cf. Barthes 1979: “From Work to Text”.
intention, whereas for Kristeva and Barthes the author fades and gives way for the (intertextual) act of reading. I would suggest intertextuality is dependent on the context and the reading. This has relevance to the study of translated literature, as translations are at their core shifts in readership and context.

However, there are two concepts I adopt from Genette for my study: his notion of palimpsest, and the dichotomy of hypotext and hypertext. Historically palimpsests were scrolls or codex parchment pages, from which the medieval scribe had scraped off previous writing and written a new text on the page. The idea of Genette’s metaphor is that underneath this new text, the previous text can at times be sensed, in some passages even read. This is a good way of instantly conveying, for example, how in *Ulysses* Homer’s *Odyssey* is nowhere to be seen, but is still at times sensed.

Genette calls the new text the hypertext, and the old text looming underneath is called the hypotext. The hypertext, for example *Ulysses*, is a transformation of the hypotext, the *Odyssey*. This dichotomy has the advantage of clarity in comparison to, for example, Taranovsky’s text and subtext, as the terms ‘text’ and ‘subtext’ have variable common language meanings and connotations.

Another structuralist, Michael Riffaterre, calls what for Genette is a hypotext and for Taranovsky a subtext, an intertext. Riffaterre formulates intertextuality as an observation made by the reader of a textual link to a previous or later text:

> The literary phenomenon, however, is a dialectic between text and reader. If we are to formulate rules governing this dialectic, we shall have to know that what we are describing is actually perceived by the reader.
> Riffaterre 1978, 2

Riffaterre’s view that there must be a linguistic or hermeneutic anomaly in a text that leads the reader to abandon normal reading strategies and adopt an intertextual strategy (1991, 56–7) would seem to be fruitful for an analysis of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* and its translations. There are passages and episodes in *Ulysses*, especially in the parodies of ‘Cyclops’, the pastiches of ‘Oxen of the Sun’, and the musicalization of ‘Sirens’, which require the reader to search for an intertextual or intermedial explanation. When, for the reader of the source text, this opens up metonymically as a reference to a specific linguistic, generic or cultural hypotext, it is a means to a certain effect. For the translator and the reader of the target text, the situation is quite different, as the cultural trace imitated is strange, foreign, a cultural Other.
In my study on the Finnish and Swedish translations of the intertextual material of *Ulysses* I adopt Genette’s use of hypertext and hypotext for terminological clarity, and Riffaterre’s understanding of the situatedness of intertextuality in the reading of a text and the necessity of an anomaly or gap to trigger the search for a hypotext. The urge to understand compels readers to look for the hypotext to fill in the text’s gaps. This view will help determine how intertextual text is perceived and how we might spot the hypotexts of the hypertext. For the researcher it is also important to keep in mind Taranovsky’s insistence on studying hypotexts thoroughly. In general, however, my understanding of intertextuality and polyphony draws from the tradition of Bakhtin, Kristeva, and Barthes.

One can see Joyce battling with the baggage of the English language cultural trail in *Ulysses* and perhaps especially in the pastiches of the history of English prose style in the ‘Oxen of the Sun’. Joyce was explicitly aware of this question of language and tradition, and Richard Ellmann (1965, 410), Joyce’s biographer, reports Joyce commenting to his friend Frank Budgen in Zurich as early as 1915: “I’d like a language which is above all languages, a language to which all will do service. I cannot express myself in English without enclosing myself in a tradition.” Joyce is keenly aware of tradition, especially in the English language, in which he felt himself both an immigrant and a native, and one can see this conflict more and more explicitly from his first novel *The Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916) through *Ulysses*, and culminating in the great language game of *Finnegans Wake* (1939).

We may turn to the very first sentences of *Ulysses* to demonstrate how Joyce’s hypotexts loom under the surface of the text of *Ulysses*. There are more explicit cases of allusion, imitation, or parody in *Ulysses* for the study of the left, source text, context of the polyphonic model, but the analysis of the implicit intertextuality of the opening of the book will illustrate, firstly, that there is no “initial style” or “general style” in Joyce’s work, and instead the book is thoroughly stylized. Secondly, it is just this intertextuality which causes hermeneutic variation in the reading (and the translation) of the passage, and causes an experience of, or struggle with, the foreign in the text.

The first three episodes of *Ulysses*, ‘Telemachus’, ‘Nestor’, and ‘Proteus’, the so-called “Telemachia”, are focalised through Joyce’s Dublin surrogate for Homer’s Telemachus, the son of Odysseus and Penelope, Stephen Dedalus. In the third episode, ‘Proteus’, Joyce employs the technique he and *Ulysses* have become
associated with, inner monologue, but the first episode at least seems like extradiegetic narration, which a reader only later, after being more closely acquainted with the thoughts of Stephen Dedalus, realizes has been thoroughly focalized through his consciousness. In the first sentence, Buck Mulligan is observed at the parapet of Martello Tower, Sandycove, through the associative eyes of Stephen Dedalus:

Stately, plump Buck Mulligan came from the stairhead, bearing a bowl of lather on which a mirror and a razor lay crossed. A yellow dressinggown, ungirdled, was sustained gently behind him on the mild morning air. He held the bowl aloft and intoned:

—Introibo ad altare Dei.

Buck Mulligan is about to shave in the mild morning air. In the staircase he has thought of a joke, laying the razor and mirror in a cross on the bowl and playing the part of a priest in a Mass. Stephen Dedalus is naturally able to read the joke, although one gets the feeling he does not appreciate it. He associates further, noting with perhaps some disdain, that Mulligan's gown, in the role of the priest, should be girdled.

One hypotext for this hypertext is the Catholic Mass, a very culturally specific and, for Scandinavian readers, somewhat foreign form which is being alluded to and even parodied. Another hypotext, which becomes apparent after further reading of the book, together with the paratextual clue of the title of the book, or by consulting annotations or the Linati or Gilbert schemata, is the Odyssey, especially its first two books, in which Telemachus is depicted in Ithaca, where the brazen suitors of his mother Penelope have taken over the house of his absent father, Odysseus. Buck Mulligan and an Englishman called Haines, the other two tenants of the Martello Tower, in addition to Stephen Dedalus, play the part of the suitors, especially their leaders Antinous, Eurymachus, and Leiocritus.

A third hypotext in this passage has to do with the tradition of English prose of which Joyce was so keenly aware. There is a certain patina to some of the lexicon and formulations in the passage, for example the verbs 'bearing' and 'lay', which seem ill fitted for one of the foremost modernist texts, where one would expect to find, say, 'carry' and 'were'. The “Technic” of the episode, as Joyce reported to Stuart Gilbert in the Gilbert schema (1955, 30), is “Narrative (young)”. This technique has its counterpart in the mature narrative of episode 4, ‘Calypso’, which begins the second
part of the book, the “Odyssey”, in which Leopold Bloom becomes the focal character of narration.

This young narrative style is in fact familiar to a reader of Joyce from his earlier, more explicitly autobiographical novel *The Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, where the narrative voice is focalized through the consciousness of the youthful Stephen Dedalus. This somewhat romantic style harks back to the 19th-century Victorian style of English prose, perhaps to the writers young James Joyce himself was influenced by, John Henry Newman or John Ruskin (Ellmann 1965, 47; 70).

Before we move on to a critical evaluation of the translations and the translators’ projects, or the concrete analysis of the translated texts, the confrontation of the source text and the target texts, and the dialogic comparison of the target texts, here is a textual pre-analysis of the textual traits unique to *Ulysses*. This will give us an idea of the task of the translator(s). This is the essence of the source text context of the PTM: the voice of *Ulysses* to be translated is never monologic, even when it seems so, and it is even more explicit and complex in the episodes studied in the analysis chapters, in which parody, pastiche, and intermediality abound. But, as the relationships between first translations and retranslations highlight the nature of translation as an ongoing hermeneutic process of critical re-creation, and the polyphonic, dialogic nature of translation, I will, in the following, discuss the PTM as a retranslation model.

2.3. The polyphony of retranslations

Retranslation is determined by, in translation scholar Sharon Deane-Cox’s (2014, 1) terms, “the prior existence of an initial translation of a given work into a given language”. Why are certain works retranslated, very often multiple times, into languages in which there already exists a complete translation? Translation scholars Rosa Maria Bollettieri and Ira Torresi pose the question “Why retranslate at all?” in their 2012 article on the Italian retranslation of *Ulysses*. They answer their own

---

54 Although there is also a narrative shift that runs through *The Portrait*, albeit less obvious than in *Ulysses*. Richard Ellmann writes on the background of *Ulysses*: “Its use of many styles was an extension of the method of *A Portrait of the Artist*, where the style, at first naïve, became romantic and then dramatic to suit Stephen’s ontogeny. Now Joyce hit upon the more radical device of the undependable narrator with a style adjusted to him. He used this in several episodes of *Ulysses*, for example in *Cyclops*, where the narrator is so obviously hostile to Bloom as to stir up sympathy for him” (Ellmann 1965, 367).
question by noting that, in addition to the obvious commercial reasons, translation is a way of reading and understanding anew, and consequently a way of offering target readers new keys for reading the source text (Bollettieri & Torresi 2012, 38–40).

The study of retranslation could be viewed as a special area of translation studies, with a partially unique line of inquiry, point of view, and even terminology. In 2014 it was possible for Deane-Cox to cite translation scholar Şebnem Susam-Sarajeva’s (2003, 2) comments on critical thinking on retranslation being scant, and to note herself that “[a]llmost a decade later these appraisals still hold true, and a cogent empirical and conceptual understanding of retranslation remains elusive” (Deane-Cox 2014, 1). Translation scholars Kaisa Koskinen and Outi Paloposki (2015) have discussed persistent general notions of retranslation in Sata kirjaa, tuhat suomennosta (“A hundred books, a thousand translations”): the first notion is that, unlike the original works, translations “age”, their style and lexicon becoming antiquated, and thus retranslations become periodically necessary.

The second notion is what has become known as the “retranslation hypothesis”. The retranslation hypothesis is based on the thinking of Antoine Berman but is not in fact proposed by him. The hypothesis was rather a construction originally built by Andrew Chesterman (2017, 132) in his 2000 article “Causal Model for Translation Studies”, based on Berman’s ideas. It may be seen as a descriptive hypothesis, measuring the distance between source and target texts and describing later translations as more source oriented (Paloposki & Koskinen 2010, 31). According to the hypothesis, first translations tend to be target-oriented, or ethnocentric, to bring the literary work over to the target culture, and retranslations tend to be source oriented, or non-ethnocentric; to take the target text reader over to visit the culture, language, and aesthetics of the source text. As Berman’s thinking is interpreted according to the hypothesis, ethnocentric first translations ease the passage of the work into the new language and cultural context, and retranslations make it more foreign and faithful again.

55 Erika Mihálycsa and Jolanta Wawrzycka, discussing the retranslation hypothesis in the introduction of their 2020 Retranslating Joyce for the 21st Century in connection with Joyce retranslations, trace the hypothesis back to two programmatic essays in Palimpsestes 4 (1990) by Antoine Berman and Paul Bensimon, “both of whom attribute to first translations a tendency to reduce the translated work’s alterity in order to integrate it in the translating culture. Conversely, retranslations acquire the potential to approximate more closely the original’s constitutive difference, drawing on the earlier translations’ work of introducing these into the receiving culture” (Mihálycsa & Wawrzycka 2020, 2).
The survey of the history of Finnish retranslation conducted by Paloposki and Koskinen shows quite clearly that there are major exceptions to the retranslation hypothesis, and many cases are in fact quite opposed to it. What has led to this assumption is changes in translation ideals on the one hand, and changes in the target audience on the other, as Paloposki and Koskinen (2010, 34) concluded in an earlier article in English:

Time and order of appearance cannot be seen as a single monolithic entity or causal factor behind retranslations - there are always different tendencies and multiple orientations at work at any one specific time, just as there are different audiences and translators.

Different audiences at different times expect different kinds of translations, and in the last few centuries the aesthetic has moved from ethnocentric and invisible to non-ethnocentric and visible translation.

When one takes a closer look at what was destined to be Antoine Berman’s last book, *Pour une critique des traductions* (1995, translated into English in 2009 as *Toward a Translation Criticism* by Françoise Massardier-Kenney), it is apparent that Berman sees first translations and retranslations as a continuous, self-correcting process. Translation is a form of criticism (or critique, in the Romantic tradition), of critical reading and productive rereading, and thus retranslations are needed to complete the cycle of bringing an author to a new language and culture. The first translation is inevitably the introduction, or is, in Berman’s (2009, 67) terms, impure: “It is imperfect because translation defectiveness and the impact of ‘norms’ appear often heavily, and it is impure because it is both an introduction and a translation.” The norms of the target culture weigh down the first translations, whereas the retranslations have more freedom in their interpretation: “It is in retranslation, better yet, in successive or simultaneous retranslations, that translation is played out, not only within the space of the receptor language and culture, but in other languages and cultures” (ibid.). What Berman does not do, however, is to make a normative assessment as to how retranslators use, or should use, that freedom.

Berman calls the norms and expectations that define translation in a certain culture and a certain time, and the translators relationship to this discourse, the *translating position*: “The translating position is, so to speak, the compromise between the way in which the translator, as a subject caught by the *translation drive*, perceives
the task of translation, and the way in which he has internalized the surrounding discourse on translation (the norms)” (Berman 2009, 58). There is a drive, an impulse to translate, which sends translators into action, according to their understanding of what translating is in that particular time, place, and prevalent aesthetics.

The conception of what the first translator or retranslator sets out to achieve, the composite of the translating position and the demands of the task at hand, Berman calls the translation project, an articulated purpose: “The project or aspiration is determined both by the translating position and the specific demands of each work to be translated” (Berman 2009, 60). For the translation critic, in Berman’s view, it is possible to make estimations of the translation project the translators and publishers have set themselves through paratextual and contextual evidence, and to critically examine how the project is realized in the translation.

The translating position and the translation project together are what Berman calls the horizon of the translator. Berman explicitly borrows the term and concept of ‘horizon’ from the modern hermeneutics of Husserl, Gadamer, and Jauss, according to which understanding and interpretation always happen in the light of our prior understanding, within a phenomenological horizon. For Gadamer, understanding is negotiation, a ‘fusion of horizons’ (Horizontverschmelzung). For Berman, the horizon of the translator is the literary and cultural context in which the translation is to be received: “In a preliminary description, the horizon can be defined as the set of linguistic, literary, cultural, and historical parameters that ‘determine’ the ways of feeling, acting, and thinking of the translator” (Berman 2009, 63). The horizon is the literary and translatory negotiation and dialogue the translation takes part in, the target text context of the PTM. There is also a plurality of horizons, places from which to translate or retranslate a given work, which translators can navigate and negotiate with the expectations of the publishers, critics, and readers. I discuss the horizons and the projects of the Finnish and Swedish (re)translations of James Joyce’s Ulysses in the following chapter 3, “Modulations of voice and translation of texts”.

In his 1984 book L’Épreuve de l’étranger (translated into English in 1992 as The Experience of the Foreign by S. Heyvaert) Berman analyses the horizon of

---

56 According to Gadamer (1988, 269), all knowledge proceeds from what is historically pre-given in a hermeneutic situation: “Hence an essential part of the concept of situation is the concept of ‘horizon.’ The horizon is the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point.”
translation in German Romanticism, concentrating on the Jena Romanticism, the brothers Schlegel, and Novalis. For the idealist Romantics the work of art, say, literature, tends towards the idea of the Work. Language never reaches the sublime; the work never reaches the idea. Therefore the best work is self-aware, ironic, and the best translation is ironically self-aware, as Berman notes when discussing Novalis’ critique of A. W. Schlegel’s Shakespeare translations: “In some sense, [earlier Shakespeare translations] are not translations that are conscious of themselves, just as the novels before [Wilhelm] Meister had not fully attained the novelistic essence. As soon as the German translation of Shakespeare attempts to ‘mime’ the original authentically, it can only go beyond it” (Berman 1992, 106). This mimic capacity is the ability to transform, understanding the foreign by making-ourselves-foreign.

This struggle or experience (épreuve) between what is one’s own (le propre) and what is foreign (l’étranger) is the central crux of Berman’s book, and for him it was central in all Romantic preoccupations – critique, Bildung, and translation – which, for the Jena Romantics, are not clearly separated. All these phenomena are about creative understanding, reflection, about the experience of the foreign. The translation of world literature is compared to, in the words of F. Schlegel, the education (Bildung) of young Englishmen on the grand tour: one goes abroad, is changed, and returns home to change and enrich the language and culture. One does not imitate just anything, however, but only that which can serve as archetype and model: “Limitation is what distinguishes the experience of Bildung from the purely erratic and chaotic adventure where one loses oneself. The grand tour does not consist of going just anywhere, but there where one can form and educate oneself, and progress towards oneself” (Berman 1992, 48, italics in the original). The translator chooses what to translate, reflects on it critically, and presents it creatively to enrich the language and the work.

In this early work, one can also see the idea of the limited freedom of the first translation as the introduction in which the target language is acquainted in its own terms with the foreign. However, even at this early stage, Berman does not claim that retranslations are necessarily foreign or nonethnocentric, but rather that they re-evaluate the relationship to the foreign in a precise way (what he would later call their project):

Moreover, in the case of the German translations we mentioned, it is interesting to note that they are all re-translations: there were already numerous translations of
these works, often of an excellent quality. To be sure, the new translations emerge from an historically precise soil: The reformulation of the relation to the Bible and revealed faith (Luther), the deepening of the relation to the Greeks (Voss, Hölderlin), an opening to English and Iberian literatures (A. W. Schlegel and Tieck).
Berman 1992, 29.

Of these examples, at least Luther’s translation project is explicitly Germanizing (Verdeutschung). What characterizes retranslation in relation to first translation, in Berman’s view, is not necessarily a Schleiermacherian leading of the reader to the author, but a reformulation of the relation of what is one’s own, and what is foreign. First translations also play a role in this. For Berman (1992, 33), “each translation implies its re-translation”. I consider this a central task in this thesis: How do the translation projects of the first translations of Ulysses imply the horizons of the retranslations, and how do the retranslations reformulate the relation to the original?

Berman’s concepts of the struggle between what is one’s own and what is foreign were used by the American translation theorist Lawrence Venuti, who introduced the concepts of ‘domesticating’ and ‘foreignizing’ translation strategies. Venuti defined the terms especially in two influential books, The Translator’s Invisibility (1995) and The Scandals of Translation (1998). Domesticating, for Venuti, means translating the target text formally closer to the target language, and thus potentially sacrificing something of the original foreign form of the source text. Foreignizing is a term denoting a translation formally closer to the source text, and thus presumably having to make compromises in content (Venuti 1995, 43). Venuti’s dichotomy is normative: according to Venuti, domesticating fluency is assimilationist (Venuti 1998, 12), and for him the ethical choice is to forego fluent, domesticated language in translation, and to translate in a way that favours heterogenous discourse, reminding the reader that the text in question is a translation.

According to Venuti, invisible, domesticated translations have been a trend in translation for the past few centuries.” This is most likely what has led to the

---

57 Schleiermacher’s famous formulation of the two roads open to the genuine translator is: “Either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the author toward him” (Schleiermacher 2004, 49).

58 See Venuti on ‘fluency’: “Fluency emerges in English-language translation during the early modern period, a feature of aristocratic literary culture in seventeenth-century England, and over the next two hundred years it is valued for diverse reasons, cultural and social, in accordance with the vicissitudes of the hegemonic classes” (Venuti 1995, 43).
retranslation hypothesis interpretation of Berman’s thinking. If the trend is to translate fluently, invisibly, and domesticatively, and most first translations have followed this trend, then it would make sense that the new information a retranslation aims to offer is a more detailed, foreignized, picture of the source text, language, and culture. This could also be the starting point of the dialogue between the translations: If a translation must be either source-language and source-culture oriented or target-language oriented, then when a retranslation is commissioned it, as it were, negotiates with the earlier text to make a new information offer, and enrich the translation macrotext.

Venuti has discussed retranslation in his 2004 article “Retranslations: The Creation of Value”. According to Venuti, (re)translation, like any cultural practice, aims to create (linguistic and literary) value. In the cases Venuti considers in the article, retranslations create their value by establishing their difference from previous versions, by, for instance, claiming to be more accurate or complete.” Venuti also considers the intertextual dimension created by the (re)translator’s actions. Venuti assumes greater intertextual self-reflexion from retranslators: “Because retranslations are designed to challenge a previous version of a foreign text, they are likely to construct a more dense and complex intertextuality so as to signify and call attention to this competing interpretation” (Venuti 2004, 32). This heightened intertextual awareness is, to different degrees, displayed in the Finnish and Swedish retranslations of Ulysses.

Bollettieri and Torresi offer a different point of view on the question of retranslation and the domestication/foreignization spectrum by using the term reforeignization. This denotes the act of retranslating a source text, which has in earlier translation been classicized in style and form, in a way that restores its original, intended disruptiveness and foreignness. In this kind of translation strategy, according to Bollettieri and Torresi, with reference to the Italian Ulysses retranslation by Enrico Terrinoni, the translator may domesticate the linguistic surface to serve the purpose of (re)foreignization: “[M]icro-domestication might be actually necessary to make the macro-foreignization process emerge” (Bollettieri & Torresi 2012, 41). A first translation may use un-idiomatic expressions in passages which are meant to be instantly acceptable and recognizable, and overly explain passages which are meant to

59 Venuti (2004, 26) reminds his reader, however: “Claims of greater adequacy, completeness, or accuracy should be viewed critically, however, because they always depend on another category, usually an implicit basis of comparison between the foreign text and the translation which establishes the insufficiency and therefore serves as a standard of judgement.”
be foreign and hard to understand. A retranslation may use domestication in one passage and foreignization in another to counter these shifts.

More recently there has been a change in Venuti’s (2013, 2) earlier approach to translation, which was based on “Antoine Berman’s notion of a translation ethics that respects cultural otherness by manifesting the foreignness of the source text in the translation”. Earlier Venuti saw that strategies of foreignizing, the selection of non-canonical source texts, and a translation method that does not adhere closely to the source text, were required to challenge the narrowly defined fluency, or domestication, of the dominant mainstream translation. However, in the essays of his 2013 *Translation Changes Everything*, he has moved away from what he now views as the “instrumentalism” of the Schleiermacher-Berman line of thinking. By instrumentalism Venuti means what he considers a tendency in the thinking of Schleiermacher and Berman to see the foreignness of the source text as an invariant to be mediated, rather than truly treating translation as hermeneutic interpretation. Instead, Venuti (2013, 4), develops “a more rigorously conceived hermeneutic model that views translation as an interpretive act”. For me, however, this criticism of Berman, while it might be founded on the basis of his earlier thinking represented in the *Experience of the Foreign*, influenced by Schleiermacher and German Romanticism, does not apply to his later thinking represented in *Toward a Translation Criticism*, and his productive criticism method.

Berman views not only the foreignization of a translation, or in his terms, the experience of the foreign, as a complex issue, but also domestication, that what is one’s own, can mean several approaches. In considering the French translations of John Donne’s poetry, focusing on Elegy XIX, ‘Going to Bed’, Berman (2009, 98) comments that the conception of ‘a French Donne’ can mean two things, “a Donne in French, which can stand on its own poetically [...], or a Donne who would seem to have risen out of the French poetic terroir, such as it was configured at the end of the sixteenth century.” Berman clearly favours the first approach, exemplified by Octavio

---

60 In *Contra Instrumentalism* (2019) Venuti sets out to end the dominance of instrumentalism by showing how it creates an illusion of immediate access to the source text. For Venuti, the advocates of the incommensurability or “the Untranslatable” have instrumentalized translation. *Contra Instrumentalism* is a plea for seizing translation as a creative act that transforms its original, and a dialogue between cultural contexts. In the chapter “Proverbs of Untranslatability”, Venuti (2019, 83) discusses how the idea of essential untranslatability is built on myths and metaphors of “betrayal” of the “original”: “In this category belong catchphrases like ‘traduttore traditore’ and ‘poetry is what gets lost in translation,’ usually attributed to Robert Frost.”
Paz’s Spanish adaptive, free, and modernizing translation of Donne’s elegy. Berman criticizes the French Donne translations for their formal, rhetoric, and archaic qualities, for attempting to make Donne sound like a French Louis XIV-era poet. It is clear that for Berman foreignization as such is not necessarily an attribute of a ‘good translation’, or domestication a property of a ‘bad’ one, nor are they normatively tied to first translations or retranslations. For Berman, everything depends on the chosen translation project, which can be critically analysed from the target text.

In *Toward a Translation Criticism*, Berman presents the architectonics of a method for productive translation criticism:

The first steps relate to the preliminary work, in other words, the actual reading of the translation (or, as the case may be, of the translations) and of the original (not to mention the primary parallel readings that come to support these two readings). The following steps involve the fundamental moments of the critical act itself as it will appear in written form.

Berman 2009, 49 (italics in the original)

Berman’s translation criticism begins with the reading and rereading of the translation(s) with, at first, no comparison with the source text. The translation should be read with a receptive gaze, suspending hasty judgement, to find the writing of translation, as Berman (2009, 50) formulates it with regard to the French Donne translations: “[W]riting that no French writer could have written, a foreigner’s writing harmoniously moved into French without any friction (or if there is a friction, a beneficial one)”. This is an important aspect to consider in the Finnish and Swedish Joyce translations. We need to reflect on not only how have the translations affected Joyce and *Ulysses*, but also how have the translations affected the Finnish and Swedish literary horizons.

The second step of the productive translation criticism method is reading and rereading the original, now setting aside the translation(s). In this, the critic works like the translator, also in the sense that both, according to Berman, need to consult parallel texts, which contextually surround the source text and, especially in my case intertextual and intermedial hypotexts: “Generally speaking, translating requires numerous and various readings. An ignorant translator – that is, one who does not read in this way – is a deficient translator. One translates with books” (Berman 2009, 52). The critic then chooses representative examples for analysis from the reading of the original. In the case of this thesis, this means from the sections and episodes in
which the intertextual text material is most frequent and explicit, most representative of Joyce and *Ulysses*.

After the preliminary analysis of the translated text, the analysis of the original, and the choice of representative examples, the critic must turn to the translating work and the translating subjects, and their respective systems, their ways to diverge or to ‘space’ (espacer). In this, the critical examination of the translating position (the compromise between the translating drive and perceived translation norms), the translation project (the composite of the position and the task at hand), and the horizon of the translation (the literary and cultural context in which the translation is to be received) play a central role. After the third phase, the study of position, project, and horizon (not necessarily in a linear way), the critic may move on to the analysis of the translation, the confrontation between the original and its translation(s).

In this dissertation, I follow the method outlined by Berman for *translatology*, or translation studies, mutatis mutandis for a comparative literature study of translated literature. I might state here that I first became a reader of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* reading the first Finnish translation by Pentti Saarikoski, and only then read the original work in English, in a facsimile reprint of the original Shakespeare and Company edition. I then reread these, and read and reread the Finnish retranslation by Leevi Lehto while working on my master’s thesis in comparative literature, which was on the dialogue between the Finnish translations of the book. Then, when preparing for the present project, I read and reread the Swedish first translation by Thomas Warburton, and the Swedish retranslation by Erik Andersson. I then returned to the source text, to analyse what was central to the current study, the intertextual material, and chose to concentrate on examples from three episodes in which the implicit intertextuality of narration was made explicit in three different modes, parody, pastiche, and the musicalization of fiction: ‘Cyclops’, ‘Oxen of the Sun’, and ‘Sirens’.

With this preliminary work done, it is time to move on to considering the position, project, and horizon of the study material, the four Finnish and Swedish translations of *Ulysses*. The examination of the four very different projects is presented in the following chapter 3 on the translation works and the translating subjects. In the analysis of the projects, I have considered the writing in translation itself, but also, as Berman (2009, 66) suggests, “everything the translator may have said
in various texts (prefaces, afterwords, articles, and interviews, about translation or not, for everything here is a clue”). I have also here considered, passingly, the receptions of the translations, as with these translations some reviews have given cause for more paratexts and discussion of the translations by the translators. I have also conducted two interviews, one with each retranslator, Lehto and Andersson. I consider these in the discussion of the following chapter, and the translations are to be found, with my backtranslations into English, as appendices at the end of this book.

After the critical examination of the horizon, position, and project, I move to three analysis chapters, in which I compare implementation and the results of the translation projects, first in the parodies of the ‘Cyclops’, then in the pastiches of the ‘Oxen’, and finally in the musicality of the ‘Sirens’.

In this chapter I have presented my Polyphonic Translation Model, and shown with regard to the case study data of the Finnish and Swedish (re)translations of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* that the Polyphonic Translation Model would seem to have explanatory force in the comparative literary study of literary (re)translations:

1) When source texts are seen as polyphonic utterances and translations as interpretive, creative rewritings, we quickly see that a) it is the polyphonic nature of words, phrases and genres, the context of hypotexts and literary tradition, which creates the struggle with the foreign for the translator, and b) this polyphony creates a hermeneutic negotiation between the target texts and the original source text, so that new versions rewrite their predecessors, and the predecessors haunt the reception of the newcomers.

2) Considered as a retranslation model, the PTM may offer a way to explicate the Bermanian view of how translations, retranslations, and paratexts such as critiques of an author, an oeuvre and a work constitute a process of transfer of what is foreign into what is one’s own. The PTM places the translations and retranslations in an open-ended larger conversation, in which different types of motivation for translation and interaction between translations are understood.

As well as producing reflections on the (re)translation of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, I hope to make a methodological point in my dissertation by showing how bringing together
two sets of theories, the poststructural view of intertextuality and Berman’s productive translation criticism, from different but related disciplines, can be productive in conceptualizing and shedding light on the study of translations in the field of comparative literature.
In episode 17 of *Ulysses*, ‘Ithaca’, two cultures meet across Leopold Bloom’s kitchen table. Leopold Bloom, a Dublin ad-man of Hungarian-Jewish descent, representing in the book a Greek adventurer, has kindly brought home a drunk young Irish poet, Stephen Dedalus, whose name alludes to both the first Christian martyr and a Greek architect of the Labyrinth. As they sit and sip Epps’s cocoa, they decide to swap passages in ancient languages. The narration, in the question and answer format of the Catechism asks: “What fragments of verse from the ancient Hebrew and ancient Irish languages were cited with modulations of voice and translation of texts by guest to host and by host to guest?” (*JJU*, 563). Neither of the men speaks these ancient languages as a native language, but they modulate their voice, and imitate a traditional passage learned by heart: Stephen the chorus of an Irish ballad, Bloom from the Song of Solomon. The men consequently translate the passages, word-for-word, for each other, followed by some comparative linguistic analysis of the “phonic symbols of both languages” (ibid.).

Translations are products of complicated cultural and linguistic processes, each unique in context and intentions. In the case of a novel such as James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, with its troubled publication history, even the question of source text – the text which is to be translated, is a complicated one.

Furthermore, even the one and the same copy of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* does not *mean* the same as it meant nearly a hundred years ago, as the context in which it is received has changed so drastically. Extensive study and discussion have made Joyce’s text in one way more approachable, in another more complex. These parallel texts –
annotated and text-critical editions, studies and companions – affect the text of *Ulysses* itself so that the *Ulysses* translated today is not the same as the novel that was first translated into German by Georg Goyert in 1927.

It is therefore necessary, before proceeding to analyses of the translations, the confrontation between the original and its translation(s), to critically discuss the translating position, the translation project, and the horizon of the translator of the two Finnish and two Swedish translations: Thomas Warburton’s Swedish *Odysseus* (1946/1993), Pentti Saarikoski’s Finnish *Odysseus* (1964), Erik Andersson’s Swedish *Ulysses* (2012) and Leevi Lehto’s Finnish *Ulysses* (2012). In the following I present the four different translators and their translations, describing the publication context and the possible target audience. I consider how the translations are mediated to their audiences through their paratexts, and how contextual voices, publishers and critics, have affected the reception of the translations. I also discuss how the translators have commented on translation in general and their translations in particular in articles and interviews, and whether they have commented on each other’s translations.

The following presentation is primarily based on written and published discussions in the case of the first translators, Warburton and Saarikoski, and on personal interviews in the case of the retranslators, Andersson and Lehto (see appendices 1 and 2).

3.1. Thomas Warburton’s *Odysseus*

Thomas Warburton (1918–2016) was only twenty-five years old when he started translating James Joyce’s *Ulysses* into Swedish in 1943. Warburton was a Swedish-speaking British citizen who was born in Finland and lived in Helsinki. The world was at war, and Warburton was in fact living in enemy territory, as the UK had declared war on Finland in the autumn of 1941. However, he was allowed to stay at home and keep on working. He had limited academic education, as his studies in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry in the University of Helsinki were cut short. Warburton was a young translator and poet. He had made his first translation during the Winter War.

---

61 Warburton (2003, 26) notes that he looked and sounded like a Finn and had a Finnish family and connections.

He had only translated two works of prose from Finnish into Swedish when he offered Albert Bonniers, a Swedish publishing house, to translate Joyce’s monumental work, which had by then only been previously translated into five languages. Bonnier took Ulysses in its program to be published in their new Panache series, which started in 1946. The series consisted of new, often challenging, and avant-garde world literature. The series was to be known by a simple helmet-emblem on the cover, and of the authors featured in the series, many would receive the Nobel Prize in literature in the following years. Among the authors translated in the series’ first year were George Orwell, Simone de Beauvoir, Albert Camus, Hermann Hesse, and James Joyce. This horizon of the translator upheld the translation pact: the Panache series format offered very little room for the translator to explicate a specific translation project in a foreword or an afterword; the format of the publication presented the translations as though they were originals.

After beginning the process of translating Ulysses in Helsinki, Warburton was forced to continue the project in Stockholm after 1944, as the British citizens living in Finland were evacuated to Sweden during the decisive Soviet offensive. In his “translatorial autobiography” Efter 30 000 sidor (“After 30,000 pages”), Warburton recalls translating most of the novel in one year of full-time work. The translation was finished in the summer of 1945 in Enskede, South of Stockholm.

In the 1940s only a small portion of the research literature, companions and annotations available to a modern translator and scholar of Ulysses existed, and translating as a refugee during a time of war, with limited access to imported literature

---

62 French, German, Czech, Japanese (two different versions), and Spanish. (O’Neill 2005, 19–36.)
in general, Warburton names as his only textual companion a German translation of *Ulysses*. It follows that only parts of Joyce’s intricate wordplay and stylistic allusions were formally understood at the time, and with inadequate complementary paratexts Warburton was perhaps somewhat handicapped in his translation in interpreting, and therefore re-creating, the intertextual richness of Joyce’s work.

In the view of Leevi Lehto, the Finnish retranslator of *Ulysses*, Warburton’s translation is a solid and fairly flawless text, although it has a problematic way of steering clear of troubled waters (Appendix 1). On the other hand, the Swedish retranslator Erik Andersson notes that when he had difficulty understanding what Joyce’s meaning was, Warburton’s translation could be consulted. Furthermore, Andersson wonders how Warburton could achieve the high level of correspondence at such young age as well as translating for the first time from English to Swedish (Appendix 2).

Warburton’s 1946 *Odysseus* could be described as a Bermanian first translation in the sense that it is very clearly an introduction of the work into a new language system and cultural area, and, as it confirms the translation pact (the original conveyed to a new language by an “invisible translator”), it displays ethnocentric qualities. In his translation project, Warburton is throughout interested in communicating to his Swedish-speaking audience what he has interpreted as the essential content of Joyce’s novel (even at the expense of formal finesses) and, when forced to choose, he opts, to use Schleiermacher’s terms, to bring Joyce closer to the Swedish reader by “Swedicizing” the original text, rather than taking the Swedish reader closer to the foreign English language and the cultural Other of Joyce’s Dublin.

This would seem to be in accordance with his explicit translation aesthetics, as formulated in *Efter 30 000 sidor*. In this book, Warburton names three central, yet

---

64 Unclear what this translation is: Warburton reports that he had a strong comrade in arms in a bibliophilic treasure, a German translation by E. R. Curtius: “Till all lycka hade jag en stark vapenbroder i E R Curtius tyska översättning av *Ulysses*, en bibliofilklenod som bokhandlare Erik Olsoni i Helsingfors hade lånat mig och lätit mig ta med på resan” (Warburton 2003, 30). Robert Weninger (2004, 20) mentions Ernst Robert Curtius in Lernout & Van Mierlo’s *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe* (Vol I) as a potential translator, known to Joyce, of his novel into German, but that “nothing came of this project”. In the same book, Riikonen (2004, 133) reports that Warburton “compared his interpretations with Georg Goyert’s German translation”. In *Polyglot Joyce*, Patrick O’Neill (2005, 55) does not recognize a Curtius translation of *Ulysses*, only the 1927 Goyert, 1930 revised Goyert, and “Hans Wollschläger’s new translation of *Ulysses*, which appeared in 1975”. The simple solution would be to assume that in his memoir Warburton confuses Goyert’s name with Curtius.
conflicting requirements set before a translator: The translation has to be “correct” (that is to say, it has to semantically correspond to the source text), the translation has to seem “natural” (that is to say it should be acceptable in its target language), and finally the translation should convey the idiosyncratic way in which the writer of the source text uses or misuses her or his own language. Warburton’s own emphasis always seems to be on rendering the meaning first in a “natural” target language, and a sense of the style and idiosyncrasies of the source text second. Warburton uses the Swedish expression språkdräkt (literally ‘language outfit’) as a metaphor for translation: To him, translation is a question of dressing up the original meaning in a new form. In this process, the translator cannot help but display as much of his own cultural context as the original. This formulation brings to mind “instrumentalism”, as defined by Venuti, as Warburton sees an invariant meaning in the source language, which can be mediated into a new language and context.

The 1946 Panache Odysseus is a simple edition of 772 pages, with no foreword, footnotes, explanations or endnotes. The parts of the book are separated by Roman numerals, as in the 1922 Shakespeare and Company edition, but the episodes are separated by a page break and an Arabic numeral, unlike in the original edition. Warburton (2003, 28) reports he used as his source text the 1937 John Lane, Bodley Head edition, the first unlimited British edition of Ulysses, which is in other respects similar to Bonniers’ layout, but does not separate episodes with numerals.

Warburton’s 1946 translation served as the Swedish Ulysses for almost half a century. During that time, however, the study of Joyce and Ulysses made great leaps. One very influential change was Hans Walter Gabler’s critical and synoptic edition of 1984, and the “corrected text” edition that followed in 1986. In the light of the correction of the Gabler edition, and on the occasion of the fifty-year anniversary of the novel’s original publication, Warburton was offered, in his own words, a chance to correct his own previous mistakes. In the 1993 “reviderad översättning”, based on

---

65 "Eller egentligen är kraven tre. Dels ska resultatet vara korrekt, på så sätt att varje ord i källspråket får sin motsvarighet, av något slag i målspråket […] Dels ska språket flyta utan stelhet och texten låta idiomatiskt naturlig […] Det fordrar stilistisk uttrycksförmåga av en subjektiv art. Och dels ska texten också förmedla en bild av hur man uttrycker sig, ja, tänker, i en främmande kultur eller hur en främmande författare rent individuellt behandlar, eventuellt misshandlar, sitt eget språk” (Warburton 2003, 10–11).

66 "Beteckningen språkdräkt är träffande; det är fråga om kostymering. En översättare uttrycker ohjälpigt sin egen tid och miljö, inte bara originalförfattarens, ofta omedvetet” (Ibid., 30).

Gabler’s corrections, Warburton estimates that he made at least 4,000 corrections to his previous translation. In addition to Gabler’s corrections, Warburton further reports having gone through John Kidd’s “error list” of the edition. With a first translation based on the 1936 Bodley Head edition, a revised translation based on Gabler’s corrected text, and the consideration of Kidd’s criticism of those corrections, Warburton’s 1993 revised translation can well be considered the most text critical *Ulysses* translation in Finnish and Swedish to date.

The 1993 revised translation, also with the title *Odysseus*, is laid out more like the 1922 Shakespeare and Company edition, with Roman numerals marking the three parts, and page breaks between the episodes. There are still no explanations or endnotes, but there is a three-page afterword committed to the question of the source text. In both the afterword and *Efter 30 000 sidor* Warburton considers the changes, though copious, to be merely minor details that do not affect the big picture of the novel.Certainly in its larger intentions and aesthetics the 1993 translation resembles the 1946 text.

Warburton considered his translations of *Ulysses* to be a continuous process, and noted that the project could still be continued, as no translation is ever finished, only given up. In the light of this, I will consider in this present study the 1993 text as Warburton’s most finished translation, and therefore my central study material. As the 1946 text was, however, the one that was, among others, on Pentti Saarikoski’s, the first Finnish translator’s table, I will in the analysis of the text examples note if there are differences between the analysed 1993 text and the original 1946 translation. With certain reservations, the Gabler Edition of *Ulysses* may also be considered the source text of Warburton’s translation.

I will study the approaches the different translators assume towards Joyce’s intertextual allusion, parodies, and pastiches in later analyses, but I will here glance briefly at Warburton’s explicated stance on Joyce’s intertextual structures. As for stylistic imitations of historical literary styles, Warburton does not consider it necessary

---

68 "Men de alla flesta av de Gabler-Kiddiska ändringarna berörde inte en svensk översättning, för de handlade mest om engelsk rättstavning, samman- och särskrivning av ord, skiljetecken och liknande detaljer. Bilden av *Ulysses* ändrade de inte” (Warburton 2003, 112-3).
69 "Men en översättning kan aldrig bli färdig” (Ibid., 32).
or even advisable to try and re-create all the imitations. He notes that most of the periodic styles Joyce imitates do not even have a correspondent style in Swedish, and the translator should look for creative solutions in offering his or her reader a sense of the style of the source text. In fact, using as an example Joyce’s highly intricate pastiches of 18th and 19th-century prose styles, Warburton notes that a slavish imitation by the translator of the author’s imitation might lead to poor results.

If we look at the four opening sentences of Ulysses where, as discussed in the previous chapter, one can find, under the surface of the hypertext, at least three discernible, culture and language specific hypotexts – the hypotext of the Catholic Mass, the rewriting of Homer’s Odyssey, and the imitation of the style of Victorian prose – we can preliminarily evaluate Warburton’s translation project with regard to re-creating intertextual material.

Högtidligt trädde den satte Buck Mulligan fram från det översta trappsteget, bärande en skål med lödder på vilken en spegel och en rakkniv låg. En gul morgonrock, oomgjordad, lyftes lätt bakom honom i den milda morgonvinden. Han höll upp skålen och intonerade:

–Introibo ad altare Dei.\nTWO, 7

Backtranslation: “Solemnly trod the stocky Buck Mulligan from the top stair, carrying a bowl of lather on which a mirror and a razor lay. A yellow dressinggown, ungirdled, rose lightly behind him in the gentle morning wind. He held up the bowl and intoned:

–Introibo ad altare Dei.”

In the original 1946 Swedish target text Thomas Warburton had translated “morgonrock utan knoten snodd lyftes” (‘dressinggown without the knot girdled rose’), which for the 1993 revised translation he has changed to “morgonrock, oomgjordad, lyftes” (‘dressinggown, ungirdled, rose’), which would seem to be a

---


71 “Vad både en författare och en översättare kan göra är att attrapera en annan tids sätt att uttrycka sig, genom ordval, ordföljder och idiom. Men det blir inte heller bra om man strävar till att imitera på varenda punkt, för resultaten blir oundgängliga uppstyltat eller parodiskt om det blir påfallande korrekt. Det bästa receptet är som så ofta att välja någon av de många medelvägarna. Man får nöja sig med att skjuta in tidsbundna språkelement som stil- och tidsmarkörer i texten, och i vilken grad man gör det får bero av textens art och syfte, sammanhangets krav – och inte minst av det konstnärliga omdöme man kan båda upp” (Ibid., 31).
correction from specificity towards fluency. As for the first, Catholic hypotext, Warburton has clearly chosen to diminish the Christian/Catholic references. The translation does not stop to highlight or explain, but rather, for example, omits the mirror and razor lying “crossed”. With regard to the second hypotext, that of the Odyssey, the Swedish-speaking reader of Warburton’s translation, with no paratextual help of chapter titles, notes, or forewords, remains in the dark. As for the ‘antiquated’ Victorian style, there is a sense of Romanticism in Warburton’s style here, but no marked, explicit patina of the 1800s.

To consider quickly the contextual voices of the reception of the translation at the time, the Finland-Swedish scholar H. W. Donner, Professor of English at the Åbo Akademi University, reviewed Warburton’s 1946 translation for the cultural magazine Finsk Tidskrift (1/1947). In his essay, he points to the writings of Doctor Mirabilis, Roger Bacon, who noted that a translator has the conflicting task of being required to translate equivalent meaning in idiomatic form: Translators, therefore, have the habit of either preserving the terminology of the original, which is understandable only to those who know the original, or they conversely attempt new formulations that are understandable only to themselves. Donner notes that Warburton, being a native English speaker and a writer in Swedish in his own right, has the potential to overcome Bacon’s paradox, and that if it is possible to translate Ulysses into Swedish, then “Mr Warburton is the right man for such an experiment.” Donner commends Warburton on his fresh attitude and the good humour of the translation, and considers the translation a sample of ingenuity that is worthy of the greatest recognition. The examples Donner offers of successful translations by Warburton are cases in which the translator has translated the text in a very target-oriented, ethnocentric manner, substituting Joyce’s content almost entirely to re-create a word play, word music, or a pun.

---

72 “Översättare ha därför för vana att antingen bevara originalets terminologi, vilken är begriplig endast för dem som känna originalet, eller också försöka de sig på nybildningar, vilka åro begripliga endast för dem själva” (Donner 1947, 12).
73 “Man måste genast konstatera att om det över huvud taget är möjligt att översätta Ulysses till svenska, så är herr Warburton den rätte mannen för ett sådant experiment” (Donner 1947, 13).
74 “Hans översättning visar prov på en fyndighet, vård det största erkännande” (ibid.).
75 Cf. Berman (1992, 5): “The theory of non-ethnocentric translation is also a theory of ethnocentric translation, which is to say bad translation. A bad translation I call the translation which, generally under the guise of transmissibility, carries out a systematic negation of the strangeness of the foreign work.”
In general, Donner’s essay is an introduction of Joyce and his work to a Swedish reader, and is a startlingly candid text in its preference for the *Portrait of the Artist* and Joyce’s early realist and autobiographic writing to the “formal” but “spiritually empty” writing in *Ulysses*, not to mention *Finnegans Wake*. For Donner, Joyce’s spiritual development ceased at his denouncement of God and Country, and what he was left with is uncritical play with the formal music of words. Donner laments that in *Ulysses* Joyce has lost contact with his youthful self, Stephen Dedalus, and Leopold Bloom “a well-meaning first class bore” has stepped into the fore.

What Donner finds lacking in Warburton’s translation is attention to detail in literary allusions, and he specifically mentions Shelley, Greene, and Sidney. Donner analyses at length the lost allusions to *Hamlet*, and especially its classic Swedish translation by Carl August Hagberg (1847), and consequently what Donner considers to be the lost reference to Stephen Dedalus as Hamlet. Donner also criticizes English terms left simply untranslated in the Swedish translation text and lists some anglicisms, therefore challenging the translation pact, as it were. Untranslated terms and anglicisms could be seen to remind the readers that they are reading a translation, and to prohibit them from reading the translation, according to the translation pact, as if it were the original. Donner also considers that at times Warburton has made Joyce’s wordplay coarser than it originally was.
3.2. Pentti Saarikoski’s *Odysseus*

When the first Finnish translation of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, Pentti Saarikoski’s (1937–1983) *Odysseus*, was published in 1964, there had already been a public call for a translation of this influential modern classic into the Finnish language. The literary and aesthetic horizon of expectation in which the call was made, was the great post-war wave of literary translations into Finnish, and the late blooming of Finnish modernism first among Finland-Swedish writers and among Finnish-speaking writers only in the 1940s and 50s. Alex Matson had translated *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in 1946, but declined translating *Ulysses* due to the difficulty of the task.

The task was taken up by then only 25-year-old poet and translator Pentti Saarikoski. Despite his young age, he was already an established poet, with four published collections, and a controversial translator. His translation of Salinger’s *The Catcher in the Rye* inspired controversy by its use of non-literary forms of youth lingo and street slang, and his translation of Miller’s *Tropic of Cancer* led to a lawsuit over sexual indecency. Like his Swedish counterpart Warburton, Saarikoski was a young poet who had not studied English at university. Saarikoski’s academic studies consisted of studies of Greek and literature at the University of Helsinki, but he never finished a degree.

Saarikoski was a literary wunderkind, an explicitly communist political figure, and a yellow press celebrity of the day. During the last phases of the translation process of *Ulysses* he released his prose debut, *Ovat muistojemme lehdet kuolleet* – clearly inspired by *Ulysses* and Joyce’s literary style – which was advertised by the publisher as a “pop-novel”. The new *Odysseus*, on the other hand, was advertised as an eagerly awaited translation of a modern classic that was long considered impossible.

---

81 *Helsingin Sanomat* (17 March 1964) demanded translations of “the great reformers of prose” – Proust, Musil and Joyce: “[N]äiden kolmen tuntemus on avain kahdenkymmenen vuosisadan romaanin. Suomeksi ei suuria proosaklassikkoja kuitenkaan vielä ole läheskään tyydyttävässä määrin käännössä.”

82 See e.g. translation scholar and translator Kaisa Koskinen’s (2007a, 461) article on Saarikoski’s *Ulysses* translation.

to translate." Helsingin Sanomat reported that Saarikoski translated this monumental work in two and a half years.\footnote{84}

In fact, as literary critic and scholar Pekka Tarkka (2003, 27) points out in his Saarikoski biography, Saarikoski actually used even less time for the translation work. During that two-and-a-half-year period Saarikoski was in Kupittaa mental hospital and Kangasala rest home, so in fact he was left with only six months of active translating time. However, he reported from the Kupittaa hospital that he spent his nights with J. Joyce, dined with S. Dedalus, and took walks with L. Bloom.\footnote{85} Despite the extraordinary conditions of translation, Saarikoski seems to have had access to more research and parallel texts of Ulysses than Warburton. Saarikoski later wrote in his book Asiaa tai ei that while translating Ulysses he frankly knew English quite poorly, and that he therefore used “half a metre”\footnote{86} worth of Joyce scholarship, five translations into different languages, and dictionaries. Warburton’s 1946 translation would almost certainly have had to have been one of the translations on Saarikoski’s table, so there can be direct influence and dialogue between Warburton and Saarikoski.

Saarikoski’s translation was published by Tammi in their Keltainen kirjasto (Yellow library) series, as its 60th volume. The translation series, begun in 1954, is known for high-quality twentieth-century (and lately 21st-century) novels. The series has been dedicated to “filling the gaps” of translated world classics into Finnish, but also introducing new literature from smaller language areas to Finnish-speaking readers. The writers published in the series include 28 Nobel-prize winners, but, as literary scholar Heta Pyrhönen (2016, 10–16) remarks, it has also presented a counter-discourse to the western canon by introducing modern writers from around the world into the realm of Finnish translated literature.

Saarikoski’s translation was published by Tammi in their Keltainen kirjasto (Yellow library) series, as its 60th volume. The translation series, begun in 1954, is known for high-quality twentieth-century (and lately 21st-century) novels. The series has been dedicated to “filling the gaps” of translated world classics into Finnish, but also introducing new literature from smaller language areas to Finnish-speaking readers. The writers published in the series include 28 Nobel-prize winners, but, as literary scholar Heta Pyrhönen (2016, 10–16) remarks, it has also presented a counter-discourse to the western canon by introducing modern writers from around the world into the realm of Finnish translated literature.

\footnote{84} “Pentti Saarikosken Jännityksellä odotettu suomennostyö on loppuun suoritettu […] Odysseus on kielellisen taituruuden mestarinäyte, jota kauan pidettiin mahdottomana kääntää suomeksi” (HS, 29 Nov 1964).

\footnote{85} “Joyce oli todellinen tyylin virtuoosi, joka yksistään Odysseusessaan on käyttänyt n. 30.000 eri sanaa, kun romaaneissa normaalisti on vain muutama tuhat. Teoksen suomentaja Pentti Saarikoski in selvinnyt tästä vaativaan työstään kahdessa ja puolessa vuodessa” (HS, 24 Nov 1964).

\footnote{86} “Teidän jaloa sydäntänne ehkä ilahduttaa kuulla, että minä vietän yöni herra J. Joycen seurassa, aterioilla on pöytäkumppanini herra S. Dedalus, puistossa käyskennellessäni pidän tiukasti kiinni herra L. Bloomin käisivarresta ja silloin kun haureutta harjoitan teen sen hänen runsaan vaimonsa kanssa” (Tarkka 1996, 472).

\footnote{87} “Kun suomensin Joyceen Odysseusta, osasin englantia suoraan sanon huonomist; apunani oli puoli metriä Joyce-tutkimusta, viisi erikielistä käännöstä ja sitten tietysti sanakirjat” (Saarikoski 1980, 95).
The *Keltainen kirjasto* series, founded by Jarl Hellemann and subsequently edited by him for decades, is known for publishing quality prose, world literature but also readable novels. In line with this aesthetic, and other publications in the series, Saarikoski’s *Odysseus* features no explanations, footnotes or endnotes, paratexts by which Saakikoski could mediate his translation to the readers, or explicate his translation project. The translation proper also follows the invisible aesthetic of the translation pact – allowing the reader to forget they are reading a translation, and assume they are reading Joyce. The title of the translation is *Odysseus*, just as in Warburton’s Swedish translation. The three parts of the novel are separated by Roman numerals. The episodes are not numbered, unlike in Warburton, but are marked by a horizontal line, and an initial at the beginning of the episodes. There are no other paratexts in the book except for a half a page apology by Saarikoski at the end of the book, in which he abstains from commenting on the obstacles he has overcome, and those that he says proved to him overwhelming.88 I have not been able to confirm the source text of Saarikoski’s translation, but the similarities between the 1937 Bodley Head unlimited *Ulysses* layout, and especially its 1960 reset edition, and Tammi’s 1964 *Odysseus*, identical down to the shape of the lines separating the episodes, would make the Bodley Head edition a likely candidate. Also the five different translations on his translator’s table (Saarikoski 1980, 95) have not been specified, but from the translations available, and from the languages Saarikoski himself translated, one might assume Swedish (Warburton), German (Goyert), Italian (de Angelis and others 1960), and perhaps Danish (Boisen 1949), while the authoritative French translation of Morel and others could have been consulted.

We can make a tentative evaluation of Saarikoski’s translation project, and his stance on the experience of foreign intertextual material, looking at his re-creation of the opening of the book:

Komea, pulsa Buck Mulligan tuli portaidenpäästä kädessään vaahdokekuppi, jonka päällä peili ja partaveitsi oli asetettu ristiin. Keltainen, vyöttämätön aamutakki kohoili hänen takanaan lauhassa aamun ilmassa. Hän pitä kuppia korkealla ja messusi:

*Introibo ad altare Dei.*

PSO, 5

88 “En tässä puhu niistä vaikeuksista, jotka olen voittanut, enkä myöskään niistä vaikeuksista, jotka ovat olleet minulle ylivoimaisia ja pakottaneet turvaautumaan hätäratkaisuihin” (Saarikoski 1964, 722).
Backtranslation: “Handsome, chubby Buck Mulligan came from the top of the staircase with a foam cup in hand, on which a mirror and a razor were placed crossed. A yellow, ungirdled housecoat rose behind him in the mild air of the morning. He held the cup high and chanted:

–Introibo ad altare Dei.”

From this example, we can see how Saarikoski has rendered the impression of the hypotexts lying beneath the hypertext: the hypotext of the Mass, the hypotext of the *Odyssey*, and the hypotext of Victorian prose. Saarikoski re-creates in his text the reference to the razor and the mirror laying “crossed” (“ristiin”). In addition, he has chosen a fitting verb equivalent for “intoned” – “messusi” (‘chanted’) which connotes with the noun “messu” (‘Mass’), for the liturgy of the Eucharist. As for the hypotext of the “antiquated” or “romantic” style, Saarikoski’s Finnish translation is quite modern and prosaic, with such usages as “kädessään vaahdokekuppi” (‘foam cup in hand’) and “asetettu” (‘placed’).

The question of the first word, “Stately”, is a famous translation crux. If one reads *stately* as an adjective, then it is “stately Buck Mulligan” who comes. Read as an adverbial, “Buck Mulligan” comes “in a stately manner”. Warburton chose the adverbial interpretation, Pentti Saarikoski chooses the adjective interpretation, and was in fact criticized for this choice at the time by Juhani Jaskari. He replied to this criticism by noting that the rhythm of Joyce’s sentence is apparent, and the comma is more than merely an English influence on Finnish. He further argued that had he begun with the word “juhlallisesti” (‘ceremoniously’), as Jaskari proposed, Joyce’s sentence would have fallen to pieces.90

The layout of Saarikoski’s translation was heavily criticized by translator Juhani Jaskari in the literary magazine *Parnasso* in 1965. He criticized the publishing house for rushing the publication, overlooking mistakes in proofreading, and for saving paper by printing the episodes together without page breaks.91 The overall reception of Saarikoski’s translation itself was largely favourable (Koskinen 2007a, 462), and he received the Mikael Agricola translation award for his work in 1965. H. K. Riikonen

---

90 “Joycen lauseen poljento on ilmeinen, tuo pilkku on enemmän kuin anglismi […] Jos olisin aloittanut sanalla ‘juhlallisesti’, kuten Jaskari ehdottaa, olisi Joycen lause täysin särkynyt” (Saarikoski 1965, 369).

(2004, 137) notes that at the time of publication, Saarikoski’s “translation was favourably reviewed, although it was relatively easy to find mistakes in the details”.

In his review in Parnasso, even as he commended the translation for its free-flowing humour, Juhani Jaskari criticized Saarikoski’s Odysseus for containing too many miss-played tones, miss-chosen expressions, and obvious mistakes. In general, Jaskari is bemused to find that Saarikoski fares better in the more complex episodes of the novel (the ones he refers to explicitly are the episodes with most markedly parodic and stylized narration), and is more prone to mistakes “in the less difficult ones” (in the context it is clear he is referring to the more monologic, early episodes).

Saarikoski answered Jaskari’s criticism in Parnasso, implying that translators cannot spend enough time on their translations with the salaries they are paid. This also allowed him to explicate his translating position by highlighting the choices a translator makes, as opposed to simply “getting something right” or “making a mistake”.

Another contextual voice, Thomas Warburton reviewed Saarikoski’s translation for Uusi Suomi newspaper. His review was overall more positive, concluding that Saarikoski has finished his work in laudable fashion. However, he could be seen to agree with Jaskari’s opinion that Saarikoski is more successful in the more difficult episodes of the novel, as he notes that Saarikoski is more at home depicting the inner monologues of Leopold and Molly Bloom than in the episodes concentrating on Stephen Dedalus (the so-called “initial style” episodes).

91 Later the reputation of the translation has turned into one of an overly free translation filled with mistakes. Between the extremes of heroic feat and utter failure, I hope to provide a more nuanced reading, as H. K. Riikonen (2004, 137) has called for: “In spite of later treatments by Dahl 1982 and Robinson 1987, a thorough discussion of the merits and drawbacks of Saarikoski’s translation is needed.”

92 “Saarikosken käännöksen suurimpia ansioita on, että Joycen huumori ei ole siinä lainkaan nuutunut, kuten se helposti olisi jonkun pedantimman ja näpertelevämnän kääntäjän käsissä voinut tehdä” (Jaskari 1965, 275).

93 “Kaikkialta kirjasta löytyy nasevia keksintöjä ja pitkiäkin jaksoja, joissa ei juuri moitteen sijaa ole, mutta liian paljon on sitten taas korvakuelolta soitettua, vierestä valittuja sanoja, ilmeisiä hakasahduksia” (ibid.).

94 “Onkin hupaista, että hän tuntuu onnistuneen miltei järjestään paremmin etukäteen katsoen vaikkeimmissa luvuissa kuin vähemmän vaikeissa” (ibid.).

95 “Niin kuin Eliot Autoon maahansa, olisi minun pitänyt liittää Odysseusekseen pitkä selitys, se olisi ollut hyvä esitys kääntäjän probleemeista, ja se olisi ollut terävä oka kustantajan lihassa” (Saarikoski 1965, 370).

96 “Pentti Saarikoski on vienyt työnsä päätökseen tavalla, jolle arvosanaksi sopii yksinomaan kiitettävää” (Warburton 1994, 86).

97 “Tässä on Saarikoskella ollut jokus vaikeuksia oikean sääyn tapaamisessa, ja hänen käännöksensä on melko sanatarkkaa mutta huomattavasti alkutekstitä raskaampaa proosaa” (Warburton 1994, 84).
Saarikoski’s ‘Sirens’ and ‘Cyclops’ episodes especially impressive, and episode 15, ‘Circe’, to be Saarikoski’s ultimate victory. The episodes both Jaskari and Warburton praise (in different terms) in Saarikoski’s translation, are those of a more explicitly intertextual, parodic nature, in which Saarikoski’s own tendencies towards “Menippean satire” are allowed to flourish.

Saarikoski is one of the best-known Finnish translators. His translation oeuvre of about seventy publications includes source texts from ancient poetry to modern American literature, and source languages as various as Latin, Greek, English, Italian, Swedish, Norwegian, and German. Alongside the Danish translator Mogens Boisen (who translated Ulysses three times), he has the distinction of being one of the only two translators who have translated both Joyce’s Ulysses and Homer’s Odyssey. He was, however, always first and foremost a writer and poet, and as a translator he was often considered to have taken too many liberties with his source texts and thus turned the translations into his own works. This is type of translation is sometimes even known in Finnish as the “Saarikoski syndrome” (Koskinen 2007b, 504). As Kaisa Koskinen points out, however, this reputation is to some extent unwarranted, and most of Saarikoski’s translations are ambitious and dedicated.

Translator and translation scholar Hilkka Pekkanen has made a translator profile of Saarikoski in her PhD thesis The Duet between the Author and the Translator (2010). The profile is based on a quantitative and qualitative analysis of style through shifts in thirty pages of Saarikoski’s translation of Dubliners, and ten pages of his translation of Saul Bellow’s Herzog. Pekkanen (2010, 14) attempts to define a translator’s idiolect or style “in terms of measuring their quantifiable distance from the source text on the basis of identifiable shifts at the formal linguistic level” (emphasis original). Pekkanen (2010, 112) finds that Saarikoski’s most characteristic trait is what she calls expansion replacement shift, whereby the source text is expanded in the target text, but no content is added, which is not present in the source text:

“Expansion through replacement appeared to be the optional shift strategy he tended
to favour most, and he was the only one of the four translators to prefer expanding through replacement to *addition*” (emphasis original). Pekkanen also finds Saarikoski’s quantitative distance from his Joyce source text smaller in comparison to earlier Joyce translator Alex Matson in his translation of the *Portrait of the Artist*. In Pekkanen’s analysis (2010, 98-100), Matson is found to use twice as many shifts as Saarikoski.

For Saarikoski, the ability to write in one’s own language, the target language, was the most important quality of a translator. In *Parnasso* in 1963, while working on the translation of *Ulysses*, Saarikoski posed the polemic question whether translating was even possible, and further, what is the art of translation.100 His answer was that the translator needs to understand his source text, but most importantly he needs to be able to render the meaning and experience in his own language: to be a capable writer.101 He further suggests that the equivalence of the source text and the target text is less important than the dynamic between the target text and the target text reader.102 This is a view of translation which resonates with Antoine Berman’s view of translation as hermeneutic interpretation and creative re-creation.

In their article “Anxieties of influence” translation scholars Kaisa Koskinen and Outi Paloposki have considered different retranslations of Saarikoski’s first translations, and note that Saarikoski has metamorphosed from a daring retranslator of classics like Homer’s *Odyssey* into “an outdated first translator” (Koskinen & Paloposki 2015, 30). They found that Saarikoski, as an influential translator figure, constantly forces retranslators to take a stance toward his earlier translation. As I move on to the next translation of *Ulysses*, we also move into the territory of retranslation.

100 “Mitä kirjallisuuden suomentaminen on? Mitä on kääntämisen taide” (Saarikoski 1963, 351).
101 “[Kääntäjän] on ymmärrettävä esitetäänä oleva sanallinen esitys, tajuttava tämän esittämä elämys ja kokemus maailmasta […] Kun kääntäjä on ymmärtänyt esitetäänä olevan sanallisen esityksen, hänen täytyy kyetä esittämään se omalla kielellään, ts. hänen täytyy olla oman kielensä käyttäjänä, kirjailijana pätevä” (Saarikoski 1963, 351).
102 “Kun käännös on valmis, painettu ja julkaistu, ei merkistse mitään onko se ’alkuteoksen tarkka kuva’ vai ei; se on irtautunut alkuteoksesta omaksi koneistokseen, joka toimii tai ei toimi, joka elää tai ei elä” (Saarikoski 1963, 352-3).
3.3. Erik Andersson’s *Ulysses*

The first Swedish translation of *Ulysses*, Thomas Warburton’s *Odysseus*, served for almost fifty years, and in the afterword of the 1993 revised edition he writes that he hopes it will live for a hundred years more. It is therefore perhaps slightly surprising that a new translation of the novel, the Erik Andersson (born 1962) *Ulysses*, was released only twenty years after that, in 2012.\(^{103}\)

When Andersson completed his four-year project of retranslating *Ulysses*, at the age of 50, he was already an established writer, translator, and retranslator. Andersson has translated from English to Swedish, among others, the works of Oscar Wilde, Nick Hornby, James Ellroy, and Flann O’Brien, but, in addition to the *Ulysses* translation, he is best known as the Swedish retranslator of *The Lord of the Rings*.\(^{104}\)

By the time of the publication of his *Ulysses*, he had already produced six original works of prose.

Andersson begun his work at the publishing house’s request (Appendix 2). The publisher was Albert Bonniers förlag, the same publisher as the 1946 Warbuton first translation (the 1993 Warburton revised translation was by Bonnier Alba of the same business family). Andersson does not consider that he had a personal translating drive in his retranslation, but rather assumes the position of an objective working translator working at the publishing house’s behest. Nor does Andersson recognize having been given any explicit or implicit translation task by the publisher that would dictate what was expected of the retranslation (Appendix 2).

One can make some assumptions about an implicit translation project with Andersson’s *Ulysses* by some outward signs. One is the Greek blue colour of the covers, imitating the one in which Joyce insisted the first Shakespeare and Company edition of *Ulysses* should be bound. The other is the nonethnocentric title *Ulysses*, contrary to Warburton’s *Odysseus*. In addition to the Greek blue covers, the Andersson *Ulysses* follows the layout of the 1922 Shakespeare and Company *Ulysses* in the Roman numerals separating the parts of the novel, and merely a page break (as

---

\(^{103}\) Less surprising when one remembers the 1993 translation was published fifty years after Joyce’s death, as the copyright protection of Joyce’s work was lifted under the legislation of the time. The seventy years’ protection, stipulated by new legislation in 1995, ended in 2011.

\(^{104}\) *Ringarnas herre* 2004 – 2005 (in three parts).
opposed to a numeral or a title) separating the episodes. As for paratexts, the 2012
*Ulysses* offers an afterword by Stephen Farran-Lee, and a glossary of foreign terms.

The layout of the 2012 Swedish retranslation of *Ulysses* would certainly seem to
present itself as a more authentic, more authorial, and more source-text oriented
translation, as if it were the “original *Ulysses*”, now truly and finally “conveyed” into
Swedish. Andersson, however, had hoped to call his translation *Odysseus*, but the
publisher wanted to highlight the novelty of the translation by a new title (Appendix 2).
Overall, Andersson offers no criticism of the first Warburton translation, and no
explicit translation project to actively differ from it. In fact, in a personal interview
(conducted on 4 Dec 2015) and in a book he published about the translation project,
*Dag ut och dag in med en dag i Dublin* (2012), Andersson explains how he used
Warburton’s first translation as a “safety net”, comparing his translation after each
completed chapter to the translation of his predecessor:

> When I thought I was finished with a chapter, I picked up Warburton and checked
> if there was something he had done completely different. If there was, I had
> another look at my text: Why is it different? Who has it right? [...] When I feared
> I had missed something, it was an extra check.

Appendix 2

In *Dag ut och dag in*, a paratextual companion to the translation in a separate
publication, he further elaborates that as a result of this comparison, he might use his
own translation, or make changes according to Warburton’s interpretation. Indeed,
theoretically it would be possible that at some passage he might find that Warburton’s
translation was entirely “correct”:

> If I saw that what Warburton has written here is just right, then I just took it! There
> are some examples of that. But often it is difficult to take something from a
different translation, because something that is correct in one context might not
work in another.

Appendix 2

This makes the earlier translation by Warburton the main parallel text of Andersson’s
translation. The retranslation is written throughout in dialogue with the first
translation. As another textual companion, he mentions a German translation but
notes he did not make much use of it (Appendix 2). As his source text, Andersson
names the Gabler edition.
The critical conceptual voices of the reception of the new translation were quite favourable. According to Svenska Dagbladet critic Tommy Olofsson, the translation is at times close to Warburton’s first interpretation, and when it parts from it, it is to meet Joyce’s stylistic, lyrical, and rhythmical dexterity. Olofsson criticizes Andersson for missing the spirit (namely the rhythm of intercourse) of the early parts of chapter 14, ‘Oxen of the Sun’, and therefore the whole episode. In Dagens Nyheter Sara Danius described the translation as astoundingly modern, and especially noted how Andersson had reproduced the sensuality and inventiveness of Joyce’s prose. An interesting point in the review is made when Danius describes the retranslation as seeming as if Joyce had grown up a Swedish-speaker, and were ‘speaking’ here and now.

This view resembles the case of the “French Donne”, described by Berman (2009, 98-100), in which the strange and foreign of the linguistic and cultural Other has been diminished by planting it in the target language, culture, and history, as if it had risen from that terroir. Sara Danius’ review implies that Andersson has not taken his translation closer to Joyce, but vice versa brought Joyce to meet the target text receiver. There is a dynamic element also to Andersson’s translation aesthetics, namely his view of his translating position. In his interview, he talks extensively of understanding the intention of the source-text author, and “making the text work” in its new linguistic, temporal and cultural context:

One way to think about it would be to imagine that if the author was Swedish, how would he have written? It’s a way of thinking that helps the translator, I would say. If one tries to understand the author’s position, it follows that one attempts to make

---

105 “Som synes tar sig Andersson friheten att vara verbalt påhittigare än Warburton. Han tillmötesgår överlag gärna den rytmiskt ordlekanande Joyce och lyckas genomgående bra med det” (Olofsson 2012).
106 “Här verkar Andersson ha slumrat till och är såvitt jag förstår inte riktigt med på noterna, vilket paradoxalt nog yttrar sig i att han blir träigt ordtrogen och ovanligt nog ter sig ganska vilsen, möjligen därför att han missförstår andemeningen i passage” (Olofsson 2012).
108 “2012 års Joyce talar som en samtida, ja, han verkar nästan ha vuxit upp med svenska som modersmål” (Danius 2012).
109 Cf. Eugene A. Nida’s formal versus dynamic equivalence. E. A. Nida’s Toward a Science of Translating (1964) was an early attempt to bring pragmatics into the, up to then, textual field of translation studies. To the notions of equivalency of form and content Nida added a new aspect, the effect the source text has on its reader, and the effect of the target text to its reader. In this prescriptive theory, Nida considered the effects of ST and TT should be dynamically equivalent.
As a translator cannot get everything into the translation, in Andersson’s view, he must make a value judgement about what is central to the source text and deconstruct his translation from there. Andersson compares translation to a joke: When one tells a joke, one must first understand the punchline. When he keeps the punchline in mind, he will tell the entire joke so that the punchline is delivered to his given audience in such a way that the joke works – so that it makes people laugh (Appendix 2). In the translation and in *Dag ut och dag in*, one gets a sense of a “pragmatic” translation project or, in terms of E. A. Nida, a dynamic translation, the equivalence of desired effect of the source and target texts. However, it should also be noted that in his interview Andersson explicitly considers conveying the form of *Ulysses* more important than the content, if forced to choose. If one had to compromise on something, according to Andersson, it should be content (Appendix 2).

Andersson also comments on his approach to the intertextuality of Joyce in *Ulysses*. He names episode 14, ‘Oxen of the Sun’, the episode constructed of pastiches from the history of English prose, as the most difficult in the whole novel to translate: “hopeless” (Appendix 2). The translators of *Ulysses* are presented with two basic options in their interpretation of ‘Oxen of the Sun’: either to convey a sense of a meandering, eclectic, organic tapestry of changing styles, or to convey a series of individual and acknowledged imitations, which can be traced back to their original “owners”. In this, according to his overall aesthetic of “making it work”, Andersson chooses to translate a general sense of evolving style instead of recognizable individual imitations:

You get the feeling in Swedish that there are older texts lying as it were behind the translation, and one can get a sense that there is a literary-historical progression, but I do not think you can get an exact sense that right now this is Swift or someone else like that. But I do not know how it is with the English either, if one can pinpoint exactly a reference to so-and-so.

Certainly there are guides and commentaries that do just that – pinpoint exact pastiches and parodies – but it is indicative that these studies and companions each disagree with one another on specific allusions, and it is worthwhile to remember that
the experience of at least the first readers of Joyce’s ‘Oxen of the Sun’ would not have been one of reading a pedantic composition of recognizable imitations, but rather of reading an episode of stylistic play or game in which there is something oddly familiar.

Episode 14 is analysed in more detail in chapter 5 of this thesis, but to evaluate Andersson’s overall translation project regarding the intertextual material of *Ulysses*, we may take an example from the ‘Eumaeus’ episode of the book, chapter 16. This chapter begins Part three of the book, “Nostos”, in which the dominant voice is that of Marion ‘Molly’ Bloom, the Penelope of Joyce’s *Ulysses*, who has the last word in the story in chapter 18. However, chapter 16 is narrated seemingly from the third person, focalized (mostly) through Leopold Bloom, who takes Stephen Dedalus to a cabman’s shelter, where they encounter a drunken sailor called Murphy.

The “Technic” of the episode, according to Gilbert (1955, 30), is “Narrative (old)”, and what is noticeable to a reader is the laboriousness of the narration, its proneness to tautologies and mistakes, and intentional blunders. While the logorrheic narration and ambivalent focalization in the episode make it hard for the reader to determine who is telling the tale, the truth value of the drunken sailor’s stories (who seems to take the role of Odysseus for this episode), and identities of the characters in the episode are intradiegetically constantly called into question. Leopold Bloom reads his own name in the newspaper, but it has been transformed into ‘L. Boom’.

Everything in this ugly duckling of an episode is a bit off, starting with the very first sentence:

Preparatory to anything else Mr Bloom brushed off the greater bulk of the shavings and handed Stephen the hat and ashplant and bucked him up generally in orthodox Samaritan fashion which he very badly needed.

76

The episode begins with a tautology, as anything said or done first is “prepatory to anything else”, and continues with an oxymoron, as the good Samaritan of Jesus’ parable was anything but “orthodox”. As much as episode 7, ‘Aeolus’, was an episode of rhetorical devices, this is an episode of rhetorical blunders. Andersson’s translation is representative of his balancing act between what is foreign and what is one’s own:

Som en första åtgärd borstade mr Bloom bort merparten av hyvelspånen och räckte Stephen hatten och askkäppen och snyggade till honom rent allmänt på ett regelrätt samaritiskt sätt vilket han onekligen behövde.

76
Backtranslation: “As a first measure, Mr Bloom brushed off most part of the plane shavings and handed Stephen the hat and ash cane and tidied him up generally in a correct Samaritan manner, which he undoubtedly needed.”

Whereas in the first Swedish translation Warburton had simply translated “Innan” (‘Before’) for “Preparatory to anything else”, Andersson’s translation re-creates the distance and disruption Joyce’s sentence creates in his own language by rendering the tautology “Som en första åtgärd” (‘As a first measure’) and the oxymoron of “regelrätt samaritiskt” (‘correct Samaritan’). These formulations display, in a positive sense, the struggle between the foreign and what is one’s own: they could be described as quite “free” and creative translations, but they are nevertheless based on a thorough reading and understanding of the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic dimensions of the source text in its own context. In other words, Andersson re-creates for his target reader some of the foreignness and disruptiveness of Joyce’s source text in a dominantly acceptable and familiar target language form.

Andersson’s use of the title ‘mr’ for Mr Bloom might be considered a nonethnocentric feature. Both first translators, Warburton and Saarikoski, omit the title. Joyce clearly overamplifies the use of ‘Mr’ in connection with ‘Bloom’, presumably to highlight a certain petite bourgeoisie affectation, as it is used already in *Dubliners.*

The first Swedish translation of *Ulysses* by Warburton was, in global terms, so early that it is, to some extent, a slightly simplifying introduction of the work into the Swedish literary horizon. When Warburton made a revised translation in 1993, even though his revisions were text-critical and he added philological specificity, the overall translation project remained. Even though the Swedish retranslation by Andersson did not take an explicit stance toward the first translation, it was not a passive retranslation, as the translation was made in comparison and dialogue with the first one. Thus, one may not be surprised to find the retranslation more nonethnocentric, critical, and creative.

110 There does seem to be a high frequency of ‘Mr’s in *Dubliners:* 576 ‘Mr’s in 278 pages of *Dubliners* and 717 ‘Mr’s in 732 pages of *Ulysses.*
3.4. Leevi Lehto’s *Ulysses*

Whereas Andersson’s retranslation was commissioned by the publishing house, with no explicit agenda toward the source text or the earlier translation, Leevi Lehto (1951–2019) begun his translation project in 2001 specifically to challenge some qualities of the then already controversial Saarikoski translation. The new Finnish translation, published in June 2012, is a very different kind of *Ulysses* from Saarikoski’s translation. It is a large volume, heavily footnoted, and with forewords and appendices, but also the translation proper differs notably from Saarikoski’s interpretation.

The extensive explanatory note apparatus would seem to promise a text-critical approach, and the source-text oriented form of the title, *Ulysses*, as in Andersson’s translation, has the connotation of a nonethnocentric re-interpretation. The three parts of the novel are separated by Roman numerals, the episodes by page breaks and Arabic numerals. The Homeric titles of the episodes, e.g. ‘Cyclops’, ‘Sirens’ or ‘Oxen of the Sun’ are offered in the footnotes, along with references to the Gilbert schema. The translation is mediated by several paratexts: a “Translator’s foreword” and appendices: 1) a map of Dublin, 2) the monetary units of the novel, 3) schemata, 4) bibliography, and 5) translations of four central songs in the novel.

The publisher of Lehto’s *Ulysses* – Gaudeamus, the Helsinki University Press, edited at the time by Tuomas Seppä – one of the leading Finnish academic non-fiction publishers, creates a horizon of expectation of a scholarly, philological, and possibly source-oriented translation. The translation is a rare book of fiction in the publisher’s catalogue. However, Lehto did not begin his translation in order to create a Finnish critical edition of *Ulysses*, or to make a “more faithful” translation of *Ulysses*. His project began as a retranslation of episode 11, ‘Sirens’, in which Joyce attempted to break the boundary between music and prose. Lehto, a poet who was first and foremost associated with sound poetry, attempted to translate the episode so it was close to the original word music of Joyce (Appendix 1). After translating three more episodes of the novel, Lehto offered the translation to Gaudeamus.

By that time Leevi Lehto had been working as a literary translator for fifteen years, translating, among others, George Orwell, Stephen King, and John Ashbery. He made his debut as a poet at the age of only sixteen in 1967. Lehto began his university studies with mathematics but graduated with a political history major. Lehto translated
Ulysses over a period of eleven years. Instead of trying to avoid the influence of the earlier translation, Leevi Lehto actively used Saarikoski’s translation as raw material for his retranslation:

I scanned [Saarikoski’s translation] episode by episode and placed it in the right column of a two-column text file. On the left column I placed the original. Then I began a systematic “destruction” of Saarikoski’s text with the help of the original. I like to jest that I had it easy, I had the rough translation as a given. Another way to look at it would be to say that I’m translating Ulysses from Saarikoski to Joyce.

Appendix 1

It is easy to see how this working method might lead to a translation which implicitly aims at differing as much as possible from the project of the earlier translation. As the earlier translation is already there on paper, the retranslator has in fact to change almost everything to avoid plagiarism. As opposed to the dialogue between the Swedish translations, the working method prevents the Finnish retranslator from choosing the interpretation of the first translation, even if he considered it an entirely fitting rendition.

Both the Finnish and Swedish original translators agreed on the title of the novel being Odysseus, in the Greek form that is customary in both languages. The title is thus familiar, domestic. In both retranslations the title seems to have been left strange or foreign: Ulysses. Curiously, the retranslators have different reasons for their translations having the same title. Whereas Andersson accepted the Latin form at the publishing house’s request, Leevi Lehto wanted to explicitly highlight the otherness of Joyce’s Ulysses to Homer’s Odyssey; implicitly perhaps the otherness of his Ulysses to Saarikoski’s Odysseus:

The origins of the variants are in Greek (‘Odysseus’) and Latin (‘Ulysses’): ‘Ulysses’, therefore, is already a translated title – and I believe Joyce used this choice to highlight the otherness of his book in regard to Homer’s epic. As the title of ‘Ulysses’ is “already” translated, I have an interesting opportunity to highlight this, paradoxically enough, by not translating it again.

Appendix 1

111 Indeed, in both languages, the Latinate form ‘Ulysses’ is so rare that in the names of the retranslations, the reference to the epic tradition may be lost. During this research, I have also had to explain to some members of the general public that ‘Odysseus’ and ‘Ulysses’ refer to the same character, and the same book.
The question of the title gains intertextual significance if one remembers that in both target languages the title of Homer’s *Odyssey* is known in its Greek form (‘Odysséen’ in Swedish and ‘Odysseia’ in Finnish) as is the hero *Odysseus*. In another words, in the Finnish and Swedish first translations the intertextual link to Homer’s epic is instantly recognizable to any reader. In the titles of the retranslations, the receiver needs additional paratextual information to recognize the allusion.

Arguably Saarikoski’s translation could be called Lehto’s source text, and Lehto’s retranslation could be called an *indirect translation*, but in the end, for all intents and purposes, it seems clear that the Hans Walter Gabler *Ulysses* edition has been the source text (Appendix 1), and Saarikoski’s translation an important parallel text. In his interview, Lehto also reports having consulted the 1993 revised translation by Thomas Warburton, and Gifford and Seidman’s *Ulysses Annotated* (Appendix 1). Gifford and Seidman’s (1988) companion seems to have been very influential especially for Lehto’s footnotes.

Through the extensive footnotes, adding semantic and contextual information, and the less familiar formulations of the target language those additional explanations allow, Lehto’s translation seems determined, in Berman’s (1992, 176) terms, to manifest itself. To use Cecilía Alvstad’s (2014, 270–84) term ‘translation pact’, Lehto’s translation challenges or even breaks the pact by reminding its readers of the fact that they are reading a translation, as opposed to a “mediated” original work. The translation is nonethnocentric: whereas Andersson seemed to bring Joyce to meet the target text reader, Lehto takes his reader to visit Joyce. We can begin a critical evaluation of Lehto’s translation project by preliminarily analysing an example of an intertextual passage from elsewhere in the book than in the parodic episode 12, the imitative episode 14, or the musical episode 11, which are analysed at length in chapters 4, 5, and 6, respectively.

We might choose a passage from the ‘Nausicaa’ episode, chapter 13 of the book. This is in Part two of *Ulysses*, the so-called “Odyssey”, which is predominately focalized through Leopold Bloom, Joyce’s Dublin surrogate for Homer’s hero. However, in the thirteenth episode, ‘Nausicaa’, the focalization is split between the

---

112 See e.g. Laura Ivaska & Outi Paloposki’s article on attitudes towards indirect translation in Finland (Ivaska & Paloposki 2018, 43): “[I]ndirect translation (ITr) denotes a translation based on a text (or texts) other than (only) the ultimate source text (ST).”
tumescent consciousness of Gerty MacDowell and the detumescent narration of Leopold Bloom. But Gerty’s narration is not her own exactly: “Gerty’s plumes are borrowed ones, so much so that some readers deny her any individual character. She is composed of traits assembled in a technique of collage and montage, in keeping with the chapter’s art, painting” (Senn 1984, 170). In other words, Gerty’s language is a composite of romance fiction and fashion magazines.

Gerty MacDowell and Leopold Bloom view each other and a fireworks display on Sandymount strand. The fireworks mark a shift in viewpoint and narration from the romantic scenario in Gerty’s mind to the post-orgasmic naturalism of Bloom’s inner monologue:

Slowly, without looking back she went down the uneven strand to Cissy, to Edy to Jacky and Tommy Caffrey, to little baby Boardman. It was darker now and there were stones and bits of wood on the strand and slippery seaweed. She walked with a certain quiet dignity characteristic of her but with care and very slowly because — because Gerty MacDowell was...

Tight boots? No. She’s lame! O!

Mr Bloom watched her as she limped away. Poor girl! That’s why she’s left on the shelf and the others did a sprint. Thought something was wrong by the cut of her jib. Jilted beauty.

In this example the source text in front of the translator is a composite of voices and texts. The first half is a “subjectless” agent of a popular discourse, the second half the recognizable voice of the focalized central character of this part of the book. The beginning is in one sense familiar, as it is popular discourse, but in another sense foreign, as it is impersonal. The second part is constructed as familiar, as it imitates inner monologue, everyday private thoughts, but on the other hand uses the technique of inner monologue or stream of consciousness, which would have at the time of writing been new and disruptive to the target audience.

In her explanatory notes for the Oxford World Classic’s *Ulysses*, Jeri Johnson glosses: “Her narrative proceeds in the third person as free indirect discourse, the lexicon provided courtesy of Madame Vera Verity, Miss Cummins, the litany of Our Lady of Loreto, the Lady’s Pictoral, with a passing glance at Walker’s pronouncing dictionary” (Johnson 1998, 900).
In comparison to the first Finnish translation by Pentti Saarikoski, Leevi Lehto’s retranslation project makes the experience of the foreign far more visible for its reader, or in Bollettieri’s and Torresi’s terms, re-foreignizes the literary work to its original foreignness:

Hitaasti, taakseen katsomatta, hen meni epätasaista rantaa Cissyn, Edyn, Jacky ja Tommy Caffreyn, pikkuvauva Boardmanin luo. Oli pimeämpää nyt ja rannalla oli kiviä ja puunpaljoja ja liukasta merihe inää. Hen käveli tietyllä lailla hitaan arvokkaan luonteenomaisesti mutta jotenkin varovaisesti ja hyvin hitaasti sillä – sillä Gerty MacDowell oli...

Kirättä saappaat? Ei. Hen on rampa! Voi!


LLU, 412-3

Backtranslation: “Slowly, without looking back, she went along the uneven strand to Cissy and Edy, Jacky and Tommy Caffrey, to the little baby Boardman. It was darker now and there were rocks and bits of wood and slippery seaweed on the strand. She walked in a certain way in slow dignified characteristic fashion but somehow cautiously and very slowly because – because Gerty MacDowell was...

Tight boots? No. She’s! Oh!

Mr Bloom was looking at her as she halted away. Poor girl! That is why she was left on the shelf and others went for a sprint. I thought there was something wrong with her style. Betrayed Beauty.”

The first Finnish translation, Saarikoski’s *Odysseus*, interpreted both discourses, the one of romance novels and Mr Bloom’s inner monologue, in an invisible way, resulting in minimizing their difference. Lehto’s translation project follows more the aesthetic of re-foreignizing the foreign. It follows the source text syntax, creating a strange, foreign effect for the target text reader, reminding them that what they are reading is a translated text. The text is not meant to be fluent or familiar, nor is the translator attempting to make himself invisible. Saarikoski’s thesis of fluent, domesticated narration gives rise to Lehto’s antithesis of a foreign, unfamiliar collage of styles, and the tension of the two may be seen to create, as a process, a synthesis, which makes the *Finnish Ulysses* as a dialogue more hermeneutically rich than either interpretation on its own.\(^{114}\)

---

\(^{114}\) Berman (2009, 68) would call this a *dual* or *plural* dimension: “The appearance of other translations in the analysis of a translation also has a pedagogical value. The ‘solutions’ brought by each translator to the translation of a work (which depend on their respective projects) are so varied, so unexpected, that they introduce us, during the analysis, and almost without any other comment, to a dual plural dimension: that of translation, which is always that of translations in the plural, and that of the work itself, which also exists in the mode of an infinite plurality.”
One striking example of opening up a certain relation with the Other (Berman 1992, 4) in Lehto’s translation is his introduction of a Finnish feminine third-person pronoun ‘hen’ (the Finnish third person pronoun ‘hän’ is non-gender-specific). Lehto justifies this coinage by noting that the gender neutral ‘hän’ is always a problem for a Finnish translator, but especially in the case of Ulysses which, according to Lehto, is a study on “the mystery of femininity” (Appendix 1).

The reception of Lehto’s translation was to some extent marred by ‘hen’. Cultural journalist Pirkko Kotirinta decried the term in Helsingin Sanomat, and political historian and former Finnish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Erkki Tuomioja, noted in a blog post on the new translation, that it distracts reading more often than the occasional ambiguity of ‘hän’ would have. In general, Tuomioja estimates Saarikoski’s Odysseus to be more fluent, Lehto’s Ulysses more correct. Literary scholar Janna Kantola points out in her review, that while Saarikoski sometimes simplifies Joyce, Lehto tends to make him even more complex than he already was. In terms of experience of the foreign, these are voices attempting to guard the ethnocentric structure of Finnish language from the disruptive influence of the Other.

In an interview I conducted in 2009, Leevi Lehto comments explicitly on his approach to translating the intertextuality of Ulysses. In contrast to Erik Andersson, Lehto considers the “initial style” episodes the hardest to translate, although he simultaneously insists that there is no basic narration of Ulysses, but that the early episodes are as much pastiches as the later ones (Appendix 1). Although it is a prevailing aesthetic in Lehto’s translation, in Venuti’s terms, to foreignize, in some passages his intention to “do what Joyce did” (or to do the opposite of what Saarikoski did) leads him to what he calls “absolute domestication” (Appendix 1). In episode 14, ‘Oxen of the Sun’, where Andersson chose to translate a general sense of Joyce’s tapestry of pastiches, Leevi Lehto’s choice is to translate the pastiches as

---

115 “Ja nyt uhennan tiukasti silmät siltä, että Leevi Lehto on tuoreessa Ulysses-suomennoksessaan siirtynyt käyttämään hen-pronominia tarkoittaessaan naista. Ei, ei, ei!” (Kotirinta 2012).

116 “Eniten kriittistä huomiota on kerännyt hänen ratkaisunsa käyttää hen-sanaa hän-sanan asemesta, kun pitää kääntää femininiienen ’she’. Tämä on enempi makukysymys, josta voi olla myös sitä mieltä, että tämä häiritsee lukemistensa tulkintaan kuin ne muutamat kohdat, joissa sukupuolierotteluun käännöksissä teki suuren synnyttäväksi sekaannusta” (Tuomioja Sept 2012).

117 “Jos Saarikoski välillä oikoi Joycea ‘helpompaan’ suuntaan, käy Lehdon suomennoksen kanssa viiteapparaatin vuoksi pääinvestoin. Lehdon käännöskieli ja hänen Joyceaan on tutkittava” (Kantola 2012).

individual imitations and to acknowledge them in footnotes. The translations of episode 14 will be analysed in chapter 5, “A pregnant word”, on translating pastiche. In the following chapter 4, “Jawbreakers about phenomenon” I analyse translating parody in the ‘Cyclops’ episode.
4.

“Jawbreakers about phenomenon”

Parody in ‘Cyclops’

Episode 12 of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, ‘Cyclops’, takes place at 5 p.m. at Barney Kiernan’s tavern. The Homeric referent of the episode is Odysseus’ adventures in the land of the Cyclopes, which Odysseus narrates in King Alcinous’ court in Book 9 of *The Odyssey*. The Cyclopes are crude godless one-eyed giants, lawless and ignorant of agriculture and the laws of hospitality. They dwell in caves and herd sheep. Odysseus recounts how he was trapped in the cave of the Cyclops Polyphemus. The giant imprisoned Odysseus and his men, and began eating them two at a time. Odysseus escaped by intoxicating Polyphemus with wine, ramming a burning spike through his single eye, and hiding his remaining men among the now blind Cyclops’ sheep as he let them out of the cave to graze. In the end Odysseus, already safely on his ship and on his way, taunts the blind giant, who hurls a rock after the ship, almost capsizing it.

In Joyce’s *Ulysses*, the Cyclops is ‘the citizen’, one-eyed in his nationalist beliefs. The giant’s den is the tavern, and the skin of dark wine Odysseus so wisely takes with him to the cave is represented in the multiple rounds of “wine of the country” ordered and consumed by the characters. Questions of laws and hospitality are also central in Joyce’s retelling of the Cyclops adventure, as the ‘art’ (*politis*) and ‘symbol’ (*Fenian*) in the Gilbert schema (1955, 30) suggest: The discussion at the bar circles around questions of nationality, patriotism, race, immigration and emigration, or, as Bloom comments, “perpetuating national hatred among nations” (*U*, 271).

Some correspondences amount to jokes: the unnamed narrator of the episode refers repeatedly to himself by the pronoun ‘I’, punning on the homonymy of ‘I’ and ‘eye’; Mr Bloom, the Odysseus of the episode, wields a “knockmedown cigar” instead of a burning pike; and at the end of the episode ‘the citizen’, playing the part of *Polyphemus* the Cyclops, hurls a Jacobs’ tin of biscuits at Bloom, instead of heaving a giant rock at Odysseus’ ship. There are deeper metaphorical Homeric allusions that
centre on questions of identity. As a part of his scheme to escape the Cyclops, Odysseus tells the giant his name is ‘Noman’, so that when the Cyclops’ eye is out and he calls for his kinsmen, he tells them “Noman is killing me by force!” They think he is crazy, and go away. This is conveyed in the ‘Cyclops’ episode of *Ulysses* through the narrator, whose name we never learn. Bloom, too, is not mentioned by name in the last seven pages of the episode. Bloom, the Odysseus of Joyce’s ‘Cyclops’ becomes Noman at the end of the episode.

The name of Homer’s Cyclops, *Polyphemus* (Πολύφημος), means, taken quite literally, “many-voiced”. It would be tempting to read this *many-voicedness* as *polyphony*, although ‘polyphēmos’ (“much spoken of”) differs in its etymology from ‘polyphōnos’ (“many voices”). There is, however, a plethora of voices in Joyce’s episode in the, at times harmonious, at times cacophonic or cantankerous, discourse at Barney Kiernan’s tavern. More than polyphonic, however, Joyce’s ‘Cyclops’ is intertextual, being comprised of different, varying text material.

The basic, unidentified, intradiegetic narration of the episode is abruptly interrupted approximately thirty times by interpolations – or, as Fritz Senn proposes to call them, *dislocations*119 – of different textual styles. These “foreign” text styles comment and elaborate on the events, objects and characters of the episode in a juxtaposition of style and content that often produces a humorous, ambivalent, or even ridiculing effect. During these stylistic excursions the events of the intradiegetic narration seem frozen, until the imitation ends and the narration picks up where it left off.

Stuart Gilbert (1955, 274) comments very little on these textual imitations, concentrating on the intradiegetic narration and its events, and when he does comment on them, he seems compelled to apologize for them:

> At intervals the narration is taken out of the mouth of the nondescript vulgarian and becomes mock-heroic, Gargantuan, pseudo-scientific or antiquarian in style. This technic often amounts to parody, but it is parody of a special and appropriate kind.

---

119 In his essay “Dislocation” (1983), Senn suggests that all transformations and interpolated passages in *Ulysses* might be defined by the term *dislocation*: “It suggests a spatial metaphor for all manner of metamorphoses, switches, transfers, displacements, but also acknowledges the overall significance of speech and writing, and insinuates that the use of language can be less than orthodox” (Senn 1984, 202). For my current study, it has been necessary to, first, separate intertextual shifts from narrative shifts and, second, make a distinction between intertextual phenomena of parody, pastiche, and the musicalization of fiction.
A postmodern reader of the episode no longer feels the need to label Joyce’s parodies as parodies of an “appropriate kind”, to make them “amount to something more than parody”. The hyperbolic parodies are what draw the reader’s attention in the episode, and what makes the episode a carnivalistic “false king’s day” of patriotic, nationalistic and xenophobic discourse. The parodies are also of course what makes this episode especially interesting from the point of view of the Polyphonic Translation Model.

Parody is an ancient form of intertextuality. The views and evaluations of it have fluctuated in modern and postmodern criticism from being ignored as ‘mere’ parody to being marginalized as ridicule or comic effect, and finally it has been brought to fore as a central, complex, critical and ambivalent art form. Whichever way parody is viewed, it is certainly a polyphonic, dialogic practice. In her definitive work of 1993, Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-modern, literary scholar Margaret A. Rose distinguishes at least two connected models of communication at work in parody:

The first of these is between the parodist and the author of the parodied text, and the second between the parodist and the reader of the parody, who may also be assumed to be a reader of the parodied text in either its original and/or its parodied form in the parody of which they are a reader.

Rose 1993, 39

The genre or text parodied, the hypotext, is decoded by the parodist and encoded again for the target reader of the parody. How does a translator re-create these communications? It would seem obvious that translators and retranslators add layers of decoding and encoding to this web of communications. To translators apply both the questions of recognition and successful decoding of parody as readers of the source text, but also the questions of successful encoding for their own target readers.

In this chapter I analyse the Finnish and Swedish translations of the parodies of the ‘Cyclops’ episode of Joyce’s Ulysses, using the tools of literary scholarship on parody, and applying my own polyphonic approach to translation. This approach is based on Antoine Berman’s thinking, focusing on his notion of experience or struggle with the strange and the foreign.\footnote{Berman refers to the notion of ‘Fremdheit’ in his discussion on Humboldt: “Fremdheit is also the strangeness of the foreign in all its force: the different, the dissimilar, that which can be given the likeness of the same only by killing it” (Berman 1992, 155). In the light of Berman’s discussion of Schleiermacher and von Humboldt, it seems that his contention is that the foreign has to be met in translation in the strangeness of its own horizon and culture, and cannot be made one’s own by conveying and planting it into a new context and horizon.}
I consider three questions to be especially relevant for the translation of parody. First, I analyse the hermeneutic question of the reception or recognition of parody. The basic question here is, if the parodied text is unknown or forgotten, can there be parody? Is parody only in the reception, the horizon of expectation? This question is especially complicated for translation, since in translation parody is brought to a new language and cultural tradition, and the task of the translator would seem to be to recreate it as recognizable, poignant, and in case of the ‘Cyclops’, humorous in the new context. In my analysis I apply Margaret Rose’s notion of signals of parody to study these questions.

Secondly, I study the question of form versus content, parody being the imitation of style and subject matter. I side with most recent commentators in considering that in parody the hypertext imitates and reshapes equally the form and content of its hypotext. This is especially interesting considering Antoine Berman’s call for nonethnocentric translation.\footnote{Berman speaks of ethnocentric and non-ethnocentric translation: “In fact, one of the axes of traductology is to elaborate a theory of non-ethnocentric translation with a generalized field of application. This theory is both descriptive and normative” (Berman 1992, 186). This is a likely starting point for Venuti’s genealogy of the dominating mainstream trend of domestication, and the suppressed but ethically more viable foreignizing strategy of translating.} If the parodies inform and motivate not only the style, but also the content of the parodied narration, a nonethnocentric translation, recreating the strange specificity of the original parodic styles, carrying a reference to the foreign tradition and specific hypotext, may make the narrative itself strange and opaque for its reader. An ethnocentric translation, making the translation more acceptable for its reader, might destroy the connection to the hypertext, and defeat the point of the episode.

Finally, I address the question of the attitude of the parodist. This is relevant to the PTM as a dialogic model of translated literature. Both writing and translating are critical and creative activity in a certain context, and aim towards a certain horizon, and it is therefore a central question to a translator and a retranslator to form a view why parody has been chosen as a textual strategy.

A foundational ambiguity exists in the word parody (parodia), and in its prefix ‘para’, which can be translated either to mean a song ‘near’ or ‘opposed’ to its model. In this sense the term parody itself is a translation problem. From this starting point later commentators have discussed the function of parody and the attitude of the
parodist as either critical or ridiculing towards its hypotext (as in the Satyr play), or respectful towards its hypotext but satirical towards modern society (as in the mock-epic), or ambivalent or playful between these two poles.\footnote{Margaret Rose (1993, 47) notes this tendency of commentators to create a dichotomy or division where the material is ambivalent: “Despite the fact that parodies may be both critical and sympathetic to their ‘targets’, many critics have continued to describe parody as being only critical, or only sympathetic.”}

There is also the question of the ‘comic’ or the ‘humorous’ in parody. Most classical and modern commentators consider it a necessary element of parody, but emphases differ. For Rose (1993, 52) “parody may be defined in general terms as the comic refunctioning of performed linguistic or artistic material” (italics in the original), but for Linda Hutcheon in her Theory of Parody (2000, 6), parody is a form of imitation characterized by irony, not mockery or satire. In my view, for the analysis of Joycean parodies, especially in the ‘Cyclops’, the inclusion of the comic in our definition of parody is necessary.

Ambivalence, playfulness, and humour are distinct features of the parodies in the ‘Cyclops’. They cannot be reduced to reverence or ridicule of their models, nor simple destructive satire towards the modern world, in the way some other modernists used ancient models.\footnote{Consider Ezra Pound’s Hugh Selwyn Mauberley, or T. S. Eliot’s The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock, which are decidedly derisive toward their central characters, and the time and culture they embody. As Joyce biographer Ellmann (1965, 362) puts it, they both attempted Joyce’s variety of tone, “but [Pound’s] irony, like Eliot’s, is much harsher than Joyce’s. Mauberley is ridiculous where Stephen Dedalus is only young”.
} In what follows I move on to analyse parodic structure as a special field of polyphonic translation, and to study through examples the Finnish and Swedish translations and retranslations of the ‘Cyclops’.

4.1. One-eyed imitation

Of the intertextual text types, parody is the only one named in classical literature and Greek poetics. The term parody, or parodiā (παροδιὰ) derives from an earlier term ‘parōdos’ to describe an ‘imitating singer’, or ‘singing in imitation’.\footnote{Cf. Rose 1993 (7-8), Genette 1997 (10).} These imitating singers would follow more professional rhapsodists, singing in ludic imitation of their heroic narrative, in a similar way as a ‘mocking’ or ‘grounding’ Satyr play would follow the three lofty tragedies at the ancient Dionysia festival.
Parody has also been a widely used strategy and term in the modern and postmodern era, but its definitions are surprisingly varied. Especially once one attempts to separate it from other related terms, such as ‘pastiche’ and ‘plagiarism’ on the one hand, and ‘burlesque’ and ‘travesty’ on the other, defining the special nature of parody turns out to be a complicated task.

In Gérard Genette’s *hypertextuality*, parody is reserved a limited role. For Genette (1997, 8), hypertextuality “wholly encompasses certain canonical (though minor) genres such as pastiche, parody, [and] travesty”. As parody in the strict sense, Genette (1997, 12-30) only defines those cases in which a text is transposed, verbatim, into another, differing context, creating a comical juxtaposition. In Genette’s typology (1997, 22) “a mock-heroic pastiche” (*pastiche héroi comique*) is a term for transformative imitation of style, a stylistic imitation with a satiric intention that would be closer to a modern dictionary definition of ‘parody’.

Humour, comic effect, or even mockery of the hypotext are common in definitions of parody, but Linda Hutcheon has defined parody from another angle, not through ridicule or satire, but rather as a practice defined by ironic distance. If the parody entails ridicule or social satire, Hutcheon notes it does not always or even usually ‘target’ the hypotext. For Hutcheon, parody is a textual format, which references an earlier text style, whereas satire is social and political and targets the (modern) world around the text. Parody can be used for social satire, but that is only one function of the textual form.

The advantage of Hutcheon’s approach is that she has looked at practical examples of how parody is used, and created her theory on that basis, whereas Genette has set out theoretically to create a taxonomy, for which he then attempts to find illuminating examples. Hutcheon’s work is based on, among others, Mikhail Bakhtin’s theory, and therefore she emphasizes parody’s polyphonic, ambivalent nature – the ambivalence of irony rather than the epic instruction or injunction of satire. For Bakhtin (1981b, 76), “every parody is an intentional dialogized hybrid. Within it, languages and styles actively and mutually illuminate one another”. Bakhtin sees parody as a vehicle for dialogism and carnivalesque ambivalence.

---

125 Satire, targeting, as it does, the world around it, will try to pedagogically reproach it or optimistically change it, whereas parody, targeting a previous text form, will have no hope of changing the world.
Parody is not only a formal connection between two texts, it also involves the intention of the parodist to parody another text or a conventional genre, and it is a dialogical form which also requires reception and recognition. In comparison to Genette, Hutcheon concentrates on pragmatics, the author’s intention and reader reception in the theory of parody, even though like Genette she sees “parody as a formal or structural relation between two texts. In Bakhtin’s terms, it is a form of textual dialogism” (Hutcheon 2000, 22).

Irony participates in the parodic discourse as a strategy, which activates the reader’s reception and evaluation. Instead of mockery or ridicule there is an ambivalent, self-aware irony at work in parody. Hutcheon offers a short definition of parody:

Parody, therefore, is a form of imitation, but imitation characterized by ironic inversion, not always at the expense of the parodied text [...] Parody is, in another formulation repetition with critical distance, which marks difference rather than similarity. 

Hutcheon 2000, 6

The range of textual forms covered by Hutcheon’s definition of parody is much more extensive than Genette’s. The problem of Hutcheon’s definition for my study is that she reserves such a wide range of phenomena for the realm of parody that it leaves a small and inferior position to other interesting intertextual phenomena, especially pastiche. In Hutcheon’s (2000, 33) view, parody is transformational in relationship to other texts, whereas pastiche is imitative: “Parody is a bitextual synthesis [...] unlike more monotextual forms like pastiche that stress similarity rather than difference”. As Hutcheon’s definition of parody requires only ironic distance, a critical attitude, all other phenomena, including pastiche, are defined as non-ironic and un-critical. This is impossible to accept, for reasons for which I will return in chapter 5, “A Pregnant Word”, in which I study Joyce’s pastiches in the ‘Oxen of the Sun’ episode of *Ulysses*. This analysis, based on literary scholar Sanna Nyqvist’s theory of pastiche, put forth in her PhD thesis *Double-Edged Imitation* (2010), shows quite clearly what a complicated, transformative, and ambivalent textual strategy pastiche is. In fact, Nyqvist (2010, 190) writes about parody and pastiche as parts of the same spectrum of imitative practices: “In my view, it makes perfect sense to talk about parodic pastiches or parodies that use pastiche as (one of) their means.”
Margaret Rose criticizes “late-modern” attempts to separate parody from the comic in order to give it more gravitas as a serious intertextual form.126 I would agree that carnivalistic laughter, and ludic ambivalence are serious and important factors in parody, even if it is not always “funny”. Highlighting the comic aspect of parody (not always or even usually “at the expense” of the hypotext) frees us from assigning all cases of irony in intertextuality only to parody. For Rose, parody is both imitation and transformation of form and content (or style and subject matter). Rose (1993, 36-45) formulates as the relationship between the textual worlds of the hypertext and the hypotext a comic incongruity that produces a humorous effect. Such effects function as signals of the parodic nature of the text. As I noted earlier, Rose offers a concise definition of parody as the comic reffunctioning of performed linguistic or artistic material.

I venture to offer my own definition of parody: Parody is an imitative and transformative intertextual strategy between textual worlds employed for a number of functions ranging from ludic irony (towards the hypotext) to satire (towards society), creating a comic or ambivalent incongruity:

- by ‘intertextual’ I mean to place the term in the field of intertextual relations, co-existing with, for example, the related practice of ‘pastiche’, with which it shares the attribute of being a transformative relationship between texts, but differing in other ways to which I shall return in chapter 5
- by ‘strategy’ I mean to say that parody is an intentional act which entails the parodist’s intention to parody, which must be decoded by the reader or translator
- by ‘textual world’ I mean the fact that there need not be a named author or work as the hypotext of a parody, but a more general genre, text type or convention of writing, and in fact the hypotext is always a shared image of a text, not a particular explicit model

126 Stuart Gilbert’s need to apologize for the “mere parody” of Joyce’s ‘Cyclops’ in his study on Ulysses is indicative of this late modern ethos of either separating the comic from the parody, or marginalizing parody as comic: “As will be seen again in the following sections on modern and late-modern theories and uses of parody, effects of this relegation of parody to the burlesque have included the development of a modern view of it as an inferior literary form, incapable of either complexity or seriousness, as well as of modern and ‘late-modern’ attempts to separate parody from both the burlesque and the comic in order to treat it as a more serious meta-fictional or ‘intertextual’ form” (Rose 1993, 68).
by listing the ‘functions’ from ludic practice to satire of society I want to
highlight that parody is a textual strategy that can be employed to different
ends, and that it cannot be reduced to the rhetorical device of ‘irony’ or the
social practice of ‘satire’, and finally

- by borrowing the term ‘incongruity’ from Margaret Rose I wish to bring to
  my definition the comic, ludic, or at least ambivalent affect of parody that in
  practice is often a big part of its impact, especially in James Joyce’s
  ‘Cyclopes’.

In ‘Cyclopes’, it is at times quite clear that the function of the parody of a lofty
literary style is to criticize that style, and at other times (or possibly simultaneously) the
butt of a joke may be to satirize the “one-eyed” nationalistic views represented by the
first-person narrator or the citizen, for example. Yet at other times the function of
parody may be to parody a classical literary form, for example the epic form or a
legend, to depict trivial modern incidents, in which case modern life appears pathetic
in comparison to the lofty form.

4.2. Translating parody

Parody is, in my definition, an intentional imitative and transformative intertextual
strategy between textual worlds, but could the same be said of translation? Translation
is an interpretative and creative activity between textual worlds, defined by varying
degrees of imitation and transformation. Translation is an act of rewriting, not
intended to erase the source text, but to co-exist with it and comment on it. Ideals of
translation vary with culture, language, and time. At times it may be expected that a
translation makes itself mostly invisible, accessible, ethnocentric, but still there is no
‘hoax’ or ‘plagiarism’: in any modern reputable publication we can expect the source
text writer and the translator to be mentioned on the front page. If the translation
project is nonethnocentric, aiming to inject “the language with ‘strangeness’” (Berman
1992, 188), and to remind the reader that the text at hand is a translation, not the
source text, there is still always a fair amount of imitation of the source.

In my definition of parody, I also noted the various functions of employing
parody, from critique to homage, and ludic practice. Likewise, as I already argued in
chapter 2 above, there are various translation projects and translating drives, ranging
from what Berman would call transmission of meaning to scholarly translations, and to nonethnocentric translations that manifest themselves. Translation and parodying are both textual activities, which are, in Bakhtinian terms, polyphonic: they evoke in their readers at least two simultaneous textual worlds.

Whatever the similarities, there are of course obvious differences between the act of parodying and the act of translating. One reason is contextual: translation is fundamentally an activity that takes place between cultures and languages, parody typically assumes a shared language and culture, the transposition happening in time, genre, and text type. Other reason is pragmatic: parody expects previous shared knowledge of its hypotext from its target reader, whereas the basic assumption of the act of translating would be to bring to a language and culture a text that is not known or is previously unattainable. Retranslation is, of course, an interesting exception to this rule. A third reason is perhaps a more vague sense of the difference of attitude of the parodist and the translator: it is hard to imagine a translation which would imitate its source text in a satiric or ridiculing way. That is almost counter-intuitive as one expects a translation to constitute a degree of faithfulness, even though, in actual fact, the translator held an antipathy towards or a low regard for her or his source text.

In his 2000 book *Parody*, literary scholar Simon Dentith has, in passing, discussed the difficulties of translating parody: “Parody also presents peculiar difficulties for translators, especially general parody where the translator has to find some equivalent in the target language of the mode which is parodied in the source text” (Dentith 2000, 41). For Dentith, parody is not defined by any specific formal or linguistic features, but by an “intertextual stance”. Therefore, while briefly considering translation, Dentith has passed over the option of nonethnocentric translation, and presumed the strategy of replacing the formal allusion with some other culturally relevant hypotext in order to duplicate the intertextual stance and polemic.

---

127 With reference to a favourable critique on a verse translation of John Donne, decrying prosaic translations of poetry, Berman defends what he calls ‘scholarly’ and ‘philological’ translation: “It reveals a lack of understanding of the value and the dignity of what can be called *scholarly translation*, which is a specific form of translation as introduction, and of *philological translation*, which is indispensable to any literary transfer of a foreign work” (Berman 2009, 208). We can see that Berman does not normatively call for a particular stance of translation toward a source text, nor a particular type of translation, but emphasizes an explicated translation project, and a translation type that is coherent with that project.

128 In other words, parody cannot be defined formally, but is instead defined as a number of practices with an intent to parody: “Parody includes any cultural practice which provides a relatively polemical allusive imitation of another cultural production or practice” (Dentith 2000, 9).
effect. Dentith also assumes an equivalent attitude, this time not of lexicon or syntax, but of effect.\(^{129}\)

This question of the recognizability of the allusion is one aspect of translating parody I analyse below, but I will also take into consideration two other aspects, not limited to the notion of equivalence between source and target texts, but rather the hermeneutic, critical interpretation of the source text and its creative rendition as target text in its own context. One is specifically the question of form versus content (or style and subject matter) in parody and translation. The other aspect pertains to the pragmatics of parody and translation, namely the attitude of the parodist towards the hypotext and the negotiation of this attitude between the source text, the translator, and the target text reader.

Dentith’s loosely defined parodic attitude encompasses many formal possibilities from the ‘mock-heroic’ to ‘travesty’ and ‘imitation’, and many possible functions, but for me it seems the two main forms are still the conservative, ridiculing and policing stance towards unwanted (modern) modes of literature on the one hand, and the all-inclusive and all-relativizing stance on the other.\(^{130}\) I think these could roughly correlate with the centripetal, unifying forces of language (aiming to conform and purify language) and the centrifugal forces (those trying to break old rules and create new forms) of Mikhail Bakhtin’s theory. Dentith traces one tradition of parody, which I would term centrifugal, from Rabelais to Sterne and Joyce (as opposed to the tradition of Cervantes, Fielding, and Pope), and it is, according to him, “learned, scatological, fantastic, and wildly inclusive of discursive styles drawn from all directions, high and low, academic and popular” (Dentith 2000, 78). Dentith discusses *Ulysses* as a powerful ‘eruption’ of this serio-comic tradition, and for him Joyce’s parody is suggestive of general relativity:

---

\(^{129}\) Cf. Eugene A. Nida’s concept of *dynamic equivalence* – the equivalence of the intended effect of the text on its target reader – as opposed to *formal equivalence*: “In fact the words may be likened to suitcases used for carrying various articles of clothing. It really does not make much difference which articles are packed in which suitcase. What counts is that the clothes arrive at the destination in the best possible condition, i.e. with the least damage” (Nida 1989, 92). This is an instrumental model of translation, in which something invariant, in this case the effect of the text, can be conveyed ‘intact’ through translation.

\(^{130}\) Instead of polyphonic hubbub, Dentith (2000, 76) calls this latter inclusive stance *competitive babble*: “Novelistic parody, in this second more inclusive account, does not simply cancel those genres which it attacks; it includes them among the possible voices in a competitive babble out of which the novel is constituted.”
The overall effect of these striking shifts of discursive mode, however, is to suggest the relativity of all discourse, in a manner as fundamental as that of Rabelais and Sterne. Parody here has become radically destabilising, suggesting that all discourses are contingently (that is to say socially) constructed.

Dentith 2000, 90-1

It is easy for me to accept that Joyce’s parodies in *Ulysses* and in ‘Cyclops’ are so fundamental, pervasive, and all-encompassing that the effect of the whole is relativizing and destabilizing. However, firstly, a closer inspection of the parodies reveals quite classical ‘travestying’ parodies, where elevated subject matter is described in a low style. Secondly, we find ‘mock-heroic’ parodies of the traditional kind, where a dignified form is used to describe trivial content. Thirdly, there are those parodies that could be termed ‘ludic practice’, namely jocund, ambivalent play with language and styles. The coexistence of these different forms and functions is specifically, in my view, what creates so much variation in the translations of the episode.

4.2.1. Recognition, reception, and signals of parody

I now take up the sense of translating parody alluded to by Dentith: the question of the recognizability of parody, and how the translators of ‘Cyclops’ have responded to hypotexts that would be recognizable to the source text audience but are not known to the target text audience. More generally, I will consider Margaret Rose’s above-mentioned view regarding the reception of parody, and the signals of parody. How are the forms and functions of parody re-created in a new lingual and cultural context? How does one imitate an imitation?

It is worth noting that the word ‘imitation’, often associated with parody and intertextual practices, has a different meaning in ordinary English (copying or mimicking) and translation theory. As the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* explains, the meaning is almost the exact opposite in translation theory; it means wandering too far and too freely from the source text. In his article for the *Routledge Encyclopedia*, Douglas Robinson (1998, 111) traces the linguistic history back to John Dryden’s *Preface to Ovid’s Epistles* (1680): “The third way [...] the first and second being metaphrase or word-for-word translation and paraphrase or sense-for-sense translation [...] is that of imitation, where the translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to
forsake them both as he sees occasion.” Imitation in translation, then, in this tradition stemming from Dryden (and Cicero), is the freest form of translation, opposed to the more faithful practices of communicative and formal translation.

There would seem to be three possibilities regarding the recognizability of the hypotext of the parody between the source text and the target text audience:

1) The case in which the source text audience can recognize and appreciate the parody, but the target text audience is unable to read these signals (in which case, presumably, the signals will have to be replaced with signals of other, “equivalent”, hypotexts);

2) The case in which the hypotext and cultural context is shared by both audiences;

3) The case in which neither audience can read the signals of parody.

According to Rose (1993, 41), the “reception of the parody by its external reader will depend upon the latter’s reading of the ‘signals’ given in the parody text which relate to or indicate the relationship between the parody and the parodied text and its associations”. If the reader is unable to decipher the signals, the mockery of a bad style becomes, simply, bad style – the hyperbolic high style becomes plain hyperbole. Furthermore, it is possible to notice some signals, some incongruity in the text – even to recognize it as parody – but without recognizing the specific allusion or the cultural context, the reader may still be unable to recognize the point of the satire or the butt of the joke. Rose (1993, 45) gives some examples of possible signals: “[M]ost successful parodies may be said to produce from the comic incongruity between the original and its parody some comic, amusing, or humorous effect, which, together with the changes made by the parodist to the original by the rewriting of the old text, or juxtaposition of it with the new text in which it is embedded, may act as ‘signals’ of the parodic nature of the parody work for its reader.” The reader might pick up on a humorous, hyperbolic tone, a change of genre, or something that feels “out of place”.

In Joyce’s ‘Cyclops’ one major “parody contract” (to appropriate Genette’s pastiche contract)\textsuperscript{131} between the parodist and the reader is the abrupt “jump” from intradiegetic narration to a different text type, which occurs at regular intervals. This still does not help the reader with the intended effect of parodying, as Dentith (2000,

\textsuperscript{131} Discussed more extensively in chapter 5, “A Pregnant Word”, dealing with translating pastiche.
39) notes: “One of the features of parody is that it depends for its effect upon recognition of the parodied original, or at least, upon some knowledge of the style or discourse to which allusion is being made.” One characteristic of Joyce’s writing is, of course, that in the polyglot and multicultural context of his original publication, he demonstrates either utter disinterest or extraordinary faith in the ability of his reader to recognize allusions and parodies.

For a parody passage which can be assumed to have been quite recognizable at least to the Irish members of Joyce’s original audience, but very unfamiliar to the target audiences of the four translations, let us consider the skit the citizen reads from the Unite Irishman newspaper. In this passage the basic narration is not transformed into a parodied text style, but rather a character within the narration reads a fictive text, creating a meta-level parody. As this newspaper was in the habit of publishing skits in this style (but not this one) it is a moot point whether this passage represents a parody or a pastiche:

—A delegation of the chief cotton magnates of Manchester was presented yesterday to His Majesty the Alaki of Abeakuta by Gold Stick in Waiting, Lord Walkup of Walkup on Eggs, to tender to His Majesty the heartfelt thanks of British traders for the facilities afforded them in his dominions.

JJU, 274

The problem this parody demonstrates, in relation to translation, is whether or not the target audience of the translation will recognize the parodied hypotext of the hypertext. Even if the unfamiliar aim of parody is conveyed, there is still the question of recreating the interpreted effect of the parody: how to make it poignant and funny. What has been a delightful parody of a familiar text type to Joyce’s readers in the 1920s may be strange and irrelevant to a modern Finnish or Swedish reader. In the “United Irishman skit” the joke is on a report of a diplomatic ceremony and, indirectly, the British colonial system.

I present the translations in a fourfold table, in which the first translations are on the left and the retranslations on the right. In chapter 3 I concluded that the corrections of the 1993 Thomas Warburton revised translation, although copious, were minor enough to consider the 1993 text to be the final intention of the Warburton translation, and therefore the focus of my analysis. Reflecting this chronology, I have placed the Finnish translations, beginning with the Saarikoski 1964 translation, on top row, and the Swedish translations below.
The other option would have been to place Swedish above and Finnish below, as the Finnish retranslation is chronologically the latest text.

In the footnotes I offer my own English backtranslations. These attempt to be objective, literal or word-for-word translations, but, as I will argue throughout this study, such a thing as an objective translation is, of course, impossible. The project of my backtranslations is to aid analysis and demonstrate differences, so where “objectivity” or “literalness” fail, I will err on the side of highlighting the differences between the target texts, or the differences between a target text and the source text. I am, of course, keenly aware that these backtranslations add another layer of interpretation on top of the interpretations of the translations and retranslations, and therefore another opportunity for miscommunication, but for the benefit of the non-Finnish and Swedish speaking readers of my study this must be attempted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– Protokollapäällikkö, lordi Munilla Astelia esitti eilen Manches terin johtavien puuvillamagnaattien lähetystön Hänen Majesteetilleen Abeakutan kuninkaalle Alakille, ja lähetystö esitti Hänen Majesteetilleen brittiläisten kauppiaiden vilpittömät kiitokset niistä helpotuksista, jotka heille oli myönnetty kuninkaan valtakunnassa. 132</td>
<td>– Avustava Seremuniamestari, lordi Auvosaura-Sauvaus1 esitti eilen Manchesterin johtavien puuvillamagnaattien lähetystön Hänen Majesteetilleen Abeakutan kuninkaalle Alakille, ja esitti sanottu lähetystön Hänen Majesteetilleen brittiläisten kauppiaiden sydämessi kiitokset heille hänen siirtokunnassaan tarjotuista palveluksista. 133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

132 PSO, 328: “Chief of Protocol, Lord Oneeggs Walker presented yesterday a delegation of Manchester’s leading cotton magnates to His Majesty the King of Abeakuta, Alaki, and the delegation presented His Majesty the sincere thanks of British merchants for the exemptions which they had been granted in the king’s realm.”

133 LLU 378: “Assistant Master of Ceremonies, Lord Pleasurerod-Rodding presented yesterday a delegation of leading cotton magnates of Manchester to His Majesty the King of Abeakuta, Alaki, and the said delegation presented His Majesty with the heartfelt thanks of British merchants for the services they have been offered in his colony.”

134 TWO, 320: “A delegation of cotton magnates from Manchester was presented yesterday by Courting Goldbar to His Majesty Alaki of Abeakuta, in order to express the British merchants heartfelt thanks to His Majesty for the accommodations they enjoy in his kingdom.”
One would expect the Swedish translators, translating in a cultural context of monarchy and (past) empire, to have an advantage over the Finnish translators. The signals of parody, however, the ludic word-play of the absurd names and titles aid the process of decoding and encoding the parodic intention.

How have the translators dealt with the problem of the unrecognizable hypotext? None of them has chosen to replace the hypotext with a target language oriented one with a “similar effect”. All four have worked with the signals offered by the source text. Some recoding may be seen in the translations of the title of “Gold Stick in Waiting”, which Saarikoski re-creates as a “Protokollapäällikkö” (‘Chief of Protocol’), more familiar in a republican context, and therefore more ethnocentric than Lehto’s “Seremuniamestari” (‘Master of Ceremonies’, with connotations of ‘eggs’ and, perhaps, colloquially ‘balls’), which comes from a context of monarchy and is therefore more strange or foreign. Lehto explains in a footnote to his translation, that these are spoofs of the Queen’s Guard titles. Andersson’s “gardesöversten” (‘guards’ colonel’), is also in a sense “Swedicized”, as such a historic position existed in the Swedish monarchy.

In general, Warburton’s invisible, content-oriented translation project is clear here: he simply omits much of the formal parody of the royal titles. Saarikoski’s translation conveys very little of the social satire pointed against the British Empire (and that would have perhaps been of marginal interest to his audience), but he manages to re-create the humour. Lehto’s translation seems to emphasize “serious” satire at the expense of formal parody and infantile humour. Perhaps in Andersson’s translation one would find the most balanced mix of satire against the pretentiousness of the royal jargon, but also the naiveté of the humour. Andersson is also the only translator who manages to convey the fact that “Alaki” is not a proper name of a person, but a title “equivalent of the sultan of a small state” (Gifford & Seidman 1988, 365).

135 EAU 330-1: “A delegation of Manchester's premier cotton bigwigs were presented yesterday for His Majesty alaki of Abeakuta by courting guards colonel Lord Throw from Throw upon Yew and expressed to his majesty the British merchants' heartfelt gratitude for the resources made available to them in his empire.”
Considering the process of transfer of *Ulysses* into Finnish and Swedish, these translations of parody fit Berman’s view of first translations introducing the work (with its hypotexts) into the new linguistic and literary horizon. The first translations re-create less of the strange and the foreign of the original, and the retranslations render more foreign elements, and, at least in Lehto’s case, are strange and manifest in the target text context. However, not only have translation aesthetics changed between the receptions of the translations, but also the literary and aesthetic horizon. Certainly in the case of the Finnish and Swedish translations of *Ulysses* and ‘Cyclops’ it is clear that between the first translations and the retranslations, literary aesthetics of romantic and modernist originality have turned to postmodern intertextuality, possibly changing the translation ideal from an invisible one to a more explicit comment on an earlier text.

The first Swedish translation sacrifices details of source text and language for target language fluency. First, there is the omission of part of the imperial title, and then there is the less complicated syntax at the end of the passage. In comparison to this, the Swedish retranslation adds detail of the source text, language, and culture to the Swedish ‘Cyclops’ macrotext. The Finnish first translation has emphasized a natural, invisible wordplay, as if Joyce had written this in Finnish. The Anglo-Irish context is downplayed. This context is added in Lehto’s retranslation, which on the other hand lacks ludic humour and laughter.

In addition to the colonial context, a modern Swedish or Finnish translator of the episode may have difficulties conveying references to Catholic customs, beliefs, and the church hierarchy. As the congregation at the bar raise their half pints for another round, Martin Cunningham prays God bless them all. What follows is a parody of a Catholic liturgy for blessing a new cathedral, although in the parody the subject of the blessing is Barney Kiernan’s pub:

And at the sound of the sacring bell, headed by a crucifer with acolytes, thurifers, boatbearers, readers, ostiarii, deacons and subdeacons, the blessed company drew nigh of mitred abbots and priors and guardians and monks and friars; the monks of Benedict of Spoleto, Carthusians and Camaldolesi, Cistercians and Olivetans, Oratorians and Vallombrosans, and the friars of Augustine, Brigittines, Premonstratensians, Servi, Trinitarians, and the children of Peter Nolasco[…]

*JJU*, 277
This is a case of parody in which the style and content of the discourse is very closely imitative and plausible, but the context, the blessing of a bar, functions as the signal for the parodic reading. Further down the passage, there is also a hyperbolic list of Irish Catholic saints and martyrs, virgins, and confessors, of whom many are not Irish, and quite a few not saints. Let us look at the translations of this early part of the passage, however, because it seems that this almost pastiche-like parody has been more troublesome for the translators than the more obviously hyperbolic latter part.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ja messukellon kuuluessa ristinkantajien ja akoluuttien, suitsusastiankantajien, maljankantajien, esilukijoiden, ovenvarijoiden, diakonien ja alidiakonien jäljessä lähestyi hiippapäisten apottien ja priorien ja vanhimpien ja munkkien ja luostariviljien siunattu seurue: spoletolaisia benediktiinejä, kartusiaaneja ja kamaldoleeseja, sistersiläisiä ja olivetaaneja, oratoriaaneja vallombrosaaneja sekä augustinolaisia, birgittalaisia ja premonstratiaaneja, servuksia, trinitariaaneja ja Petro Nolascon lapsia[...][136]</td>
<td>Ja1 ehtoolliskellon soidessa nähtiin lähestyvän, johdattajanaan ristin kanta yhdessä akoluuttien, suitsukkeen kantajain, maljankantajain, esilukijain, ovenvarijain, diakonien ja alidiakonien kanssa, hiippapäisten apottien ja priorien ja vanhimpien ja munkkien ja luostariviljien siunatun seurueen: munkkeja spoletolaisen benediktiien, kartusiaanien ja kamaldolilaiset,2 sistersiläisten ja olivetaanien,3 oratoriaanien ja vallombrosaanien veljeskunnasta sekä luostariviljelijä augustinolaisen, birgittalaisten ja premonstratensien,4 serviittien, Pyhän Kolminaisuuden ja Petro Nolascon5 lasten veljeskunnista[...][137]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Parodia. Kirkolliset uutiset.
2Benediktiiniläisen Pyhän Romualdin (950–1027) perustama tiukosta säännöstään tunnettu veljeskunta.
3Italian Toscanassa vuonna 1313 perustettu niin ikään benediktiiniläisistä alkunsa saanut veljeskunta, jonka pääluostarin nimi on Monte Oliveto.
4Premontrèssa Ranskassa vuonna 1120 perustettu, samoin tiukosta augustinolaisista säännöstään tunnettu veljeskunta.
5Pere Nolasce (1189–1256), jonka perustama sotilaallinen veljeskunta keskittyi maurien sieppaamien kristittyjen vapaaksi lunastamiseen.

---

136 PSO, 332: “And as the Mass bell sounded, after the crossbearers and acoytes, the incensevesselbearers, bowlbearers, forereaders, doormen, deacons and subdeacons, approached a blessed company of mitrewearing abbots and priors and elders and monks and friars: benedictines from spoleto, earthenians and camaldoleans, cistercians and olivetans, oratorians and vallombrosans and augustians, bridgettines and premonstratians, servi, trinitarians, and Petro Nolasco’s children[...]

137 LLU, 383: “And when the communion bell was ringing there was seen approaching, led by a crossbearer together with acoytes, incense carriers, bowlbearers, forereaders, doormen, deacons and subdeacons, a blessed company of mitrewearing abbots and priors and elders and monks and friars: monks of the benedictine from spoleto, earthenian and camaldolean, cistercian and olivetan, oratorian and vallombroso brotherhoods, and friars of the augustine, brigittine, premonstratian, servi, Trinitarian, and the children of Petro Nolasco brotherhoods[...]

102
Och vid mässklockans klang nalkades den välsignade skaran, anförd av en korsbärare med akolyter, rökelsesvängare, kärlbärare, föreläsare, dörrväktare, diakoner och subdiaconer, mitraberydda abbotar och priores, superiores, monkar och klosterrörelser: benediktiner från Spoleto stodo där, carthusianer och camaldulenser, cistercienser och olivetaner, oratorianer och vallombrosaner, brigittiner, premonstratenser, servi, trinitarianer och Petro Nolascos barn[…]

Och till ljudet från mässklockan, anförda av en korsbärare med akolyter, rökelsekarssvängare, kärlbärare, läsare, ostiarer, diakoner och subdiaconer, nalkades det saliga sällskapet av mitraberydda abbotar och priorer och föreståndare och munkar och bröder: Benedictus av Spoleto munkar, kartusianer och kamaldulenser, cistercienser och olivetaner, oratorianer och vallombrosaner, och Augustinus bröder, birgittiner, premonstratenser, serviter, trinitariar och Peter Nolascos barn[…]

The lack of recognizable, equivalent lexicon seems to draw the translators towards more assimilative translations, but the lack of specificity in the language obscures the main signal for parodic attitude here. Is a “sacring bell” a ‘Mass bell’ or a ‘communion bell’? Are “thurifers” ‘incensevesselbearers’ or ‘thuribleswingers’? Lehto’s Finnish retranslation, with its extensive footnote apparatus, is able to communicate much more of the specific context than the three other translations, but that does not really help to make the parody more poignant.

Lehto’s footnoting strategy is a central feature of his translation project. In addition to a translator’s foreword and five appendices, Lehto’s translation is mediated by, in all 5031 footnotes, an apparatus which takes up a half of some of the pages. These notes range from textual glosses and versions or translations of Gifford and Seidman’s annotations to conversational and far-ranging commentary on the interpretation of the source text and even comments on not only Lehto’s own translation, but also Saarikoski’s earlier translation. Not only is this visible criticism

---

138 TWO, 325: “And at the Mass bell’s sound the blessed crowd approached, headed by a crossbearer with acolytes, thuribleswingers, vesselbearers, readers, doormen, deacons and subdeacons, mitred abbots and priors, superiors, monks and friars: benedictines from Spoleto stood there, carthusians and camaldulenses, cistercians and olivetians, oratorians and vallombrosians, augustinian friars, brigittines, premonstratensians, servi, trinitariar, and Petro Nolascos’s children[…]

139 EAU, 335: “And to the sound of the Mass bell, headed by a crossbearer with acolytes, thuribleswingers, vesselbearers, readers, ostiarii, deacons and subdeacons, approached a blessed company of mitred abbots and priors and guardians and monks and brothers: the monks of Benedict of Spoleto, carthusians and camaldulenses, cistercians and olivetians, oratorians and vallombrosians, and the brothers of Augustine, brigittines, premonstratensians, servians, trinitariar, and Peter Nolascos’s children[…]

140 E.g. in the beginning of episode 16, ‘Eumaeus’, in the second footnote of his translation of the chapter, Lehto comments that “his honoured predecessor” had, due to the aesthetics of his time,
and interpretation of the text, allowing for more creative freedom in the translation proper, this is also explicit dialogue between the two Finnish translations. Lehto’s technique also challenges the translation pact, as it is impossible for his readers to forget they are reading a translation very concretely through the interpretive eyes of Leevi Lehto. Finally, this adds to the polyphonic choir of the Finnish retranslation of *Ulysses*, as a plethora of voices is allowed into the margins of the book, mediated by the translator.

By this time the target readers of the translations have learned to read the signals and play the game: we know that a leap in text style is the beginning of a new parody. We recognize the clerical context and realize that in relation to the bar it is misplaced. The hyperbolic list of saints that follows acts as a further signal, and some of the misplaced references are poignant and funny: the metatextual self-references such as “S. Owen Caniculus” (the citizen’s dog Garryowen), and the Latinate saints “S. Homonymous and S. Paronymous and S. Synonymous”, for example.

The signals translate, but do not really help to make the ludic imitation enjoyable. There is little to differentiate between the Swedish translations. There is a hint of more domestication in Warburton’s lexicon and some extra effort to follow the source text syntax in Andersson’s retranslation (and, for example, only Andersson’s translation follows the source text form in “Peter Nolasco”). In Finnish it seems there are more communicative and explanatory elements in Lehto’s retranslation. Saarikoski’s translation’s vocabulary is closer to the source text. Lehto has chosen to use archaic possessive noun inflections throughout, which, even though they are a trait of a “Finnish Joyce”, add strangeness and resistance to the reading of the translation. It seems the passage does not allow the translators room to manoeuvre: Making the references ethnocentric and familiar would seem misplaced in a temporally and culturally specific parody such as this, but complete nonethnocentricity seems equally out of the question, as some communication or explanation is needed. It follows that there is no significant polyphony between the translators, as the translations are quite similar, and do not have considerable corrections or disagreements.

With all the care a translator must take conveying hypotexts familiar to Joyce’s audience to a new audience over time and language, one must remember that there is unduly “corrected” Joyce’s intentional grammatical errors, and that Lehto has now “reinstated” the mistakes (*LLU*, 647).
typically a certain nonchalance in Joyce’s writing towards his own reader. *Ulysses* is famously complicated, the references allude far and wide, and Joyce always seems to assume a reader steeped in classical languages, theology, and philosophy, much like himself - a role for which almost no-one has the required competence. The discourse at Barney Kiernan’s bar turns to lost Irish heroes, and Robert Emmet. The argument between the citizen and Bloom is followed by a parody of a front-page news item concerning an execution by hanging, which contains a typical hyperbolic list of a foreign delegation present at the event, the “Friends of the Emerald Isle”. The list comprises multilingual puns in at least 13 languages, including, for example, Hungarian and Albanian Turkish:

[...]


Generally, when translators come across a proper noun in the source text, especially in a language that is not the source language they are translating, the foreign language proper noun is left untranslated. In this passage, however, the language and the meaning of the “names” may be ambivalent and contain a pun with several meanings and in several languages, as the case of “Pokethankertscheff” (‘pocket handkerchief’) illustrates.

WARBURTON
[...] Monsieur Pierrepaul Petitépatant, Storfjärtig Vladinnir Revoschertzeff[...]
*TWO*, 296

141 Mina M. Đurić (2020, 165-78) has discussed Joyce’s polyglot punning and the ‘back-translations’ of the Slavic delegate “Goosepond Phklst Kratchinabrichisitch” to South Slavic languages in her 2020 article “Immanent Polyglossia of *Ulysses*.” The beginning of the phrase, “Goosepond,” can be recognized as a composite of Proto-Slavic “gospodin” (sir/gentleman) or “Gospod” (Lord, God) and “Goose”. “Phklst” is marked by the diacritical signs that mark characteristics of West and South Slavic languages. The ending of “Kratchinabrichisitch” suggests a Slavic surname, and connotes, in Sovenian ‘clean steel’ and in Serbian a ‘small moustache’.
Saarikoski has translated ‘Vladinmire Poket-’, but then has associated from pocket to a flask (Finnish composite for a ‘hipflask’). This is in accordance with his overall project in the episode, namely to re-create Joyce’s ludic play. Saarikoski has interpreted playful humour as the central aspect of the passage and freely re-created in Finnish “something that a gentleman might have on him at an event” even though, one must admit, handkerchief and hipflask are two very different things. The retranslators Andersson and Lehto have followed the source text form. Warburton’s, the first Swedish translator’s, “Revoschertzeff” seems domesticated, but I cannot quite see what he is alluding to. I can only see a hint of the imperfect form for the verb ‘tear’, and consequently I have backtranslated ‘Tornkerchieff’.

To take an example a few lines later in the passage:

WARBURTON

[...][Hokopoko Harakiri, Hi Heng Tjang, Olav Kobberkeddelsen, mynheer Trik van Trumps, Pan Pollax Paddyrisky [...]

142 In a private conversation, H. K. Riikonen has suggested to me a possible association in Warburton’s translation from Vladinmir to Lenin, and from Lenin to ‘revolution’ and ‘Revos-’. There could be also an allusion in “-schertze-” to ‘schertzo’, but why Warburton would here allude to a short composition, or a movement in a symphony or sonata, is hard to imagine.
In "Hi Hung Chang" Lehto has seen a reference to the Chinese politician Li Hongzhang, but of course in the context this is also a pun on 'hanging high'. Andersson has communicated this with "Hög Häng". There are also differences of interpretation in the translations of the conjugations and word-forms in the monster of a word beginning “Nationalgymnasium-”. Saarikoski and Andersson have used ethnocentric forms, Lehto nonethnocentric (or untranslated) forms. Warburton has unified everything to German forms, essentially translating the forms from English into German.

4.2.2. Form versus content

According to Margaret A. Rose, parody imitates and transforms both the style and the content of the hypotext. One can see the grounds for this in the ancient roots of parody: The tradition of the mock-heroic imitates the epic form but transforms the content into a trivial one. The tradition of the Satyr plays imitates the tragic content, but transforms the style into a grotesque, ridiculing one. I would argue that the degree of imitation and transformation of form and subject matter is case specific, and depends on the hypotext and the function of the parody.

This question is interesting regarding the re-creation of parody in (re)translation. In instrumental models of translation, where something invariant – content, form, or effect – may be ‘conveyed’ in a new culture, age, and language, it would seem possible to convey the content or effect in a new form for the target text reader. But if the form
motivates the content inseparably, or vice versa, how can the parodic attitude be rendered in translation? And how do the first translations and retranslations negotiate these hypotexts dialogically?

The first parody of the episode is interesting in this regard in its subtlety and ambivalence. The unnamed narrator is telling Joe Hynes an anecdote about a “bloody big foxy thief” and a “circumcised” merchant by the name of Moses Herzog. What follows is a parody of an indictment letter, but one so plausible, so devoid of satire or irony, and so subtle in its transformation, that it could also be considered an imitation or a pastiche. In fact, one could argue the passage acquires its parodic tone only retrospectively, in the light of the context of the other parodies:

For nonperishable goods bought of Moses Herzog, of 13 Saint Kevin’s parade in the city of Dublin, Wood quay ward, merchant, hereinafter called the vendor, and sold and delivered to Michael E. Geraghty, esquire, of 29 Arbor hill in the city of Dublin, Arran quay ward, gentleman, hereinafter called the purchaser, videlicet, five pounds avoirdupois of first choice tea at three shillings and no pence per pound avoirdupois and three stone avoirdupois of sugar, crushed crystal, at threepence per pound avoirdupois[…]

143 PSO, 287: “For nonperishable goods which were purchased of Moses Herzog, 13 Saint Kevin’s parade, Wood Quay area, hence seller, and sold and delivered to Michael E. Geraghty, Esq., 29 Arbor Hill in the city of Dublin, Arran Quay area, hence buyer, namely, five avoirdupois pounds of first-class tea at three shillings per avoirdupois pound and three avoirdupois stones of sugar, crushed crystal, three pence per avoirdupois pound [...]”
naulanmitasta sokeria, survottua kristallia,
kolme penniä per paananmitta[…]144
Parodia. Velkomuskanne siviilioikeudelle. –
Luvun nimettömän kertojanäänen keskeyttää
daikkiaan 33 katkelmaa, jotka ovat paisuteltuja
parodioita erilaisista ”juhlallisista” tyyliistä ja
puheenparista – vrt. ”gigantismi” teknikkanen
(Gilbert-kaavio, liite 3). Nämä on osoitettu
huomautusmerkinnällä ”Parodia”; kohteet
pääosin G&S:ää seuraten. – Velkomuskanteen
voi ajatella olevan myös kertojan taskussa tai
pöydällä kerrontatilanteessa.

Parodia. Velkomuskanne siviilioikeudelle. –
Luvun nimettömän kertojanäänen keskeyttää
kaikkiaan 33 katkelmaa, jotka ovat paisuteltuja
parodioita erilaisista ”juhlallisista” tyyliistä ja
puheenparista – vrt. ”gigantismi” teknikkanen
(Gilbert-kaavio, liite 3). Nämä on osoitettu
huomautusmerkinnällä ”Parodia”; kohteet
pääosin G&S:ää seuraten. – Velkomuskanteen
voi ajatella olevan myös kertojan taskussa tai
pöydällä kerrontatilanteessa.
directly from English. Andersson has translated “pund”, Swedish for ‘pound’, but left “stone” as it is. Warburton has the old Swedish measurement of “skålpund” for ‘pound’, and “lispund” for ‘stone’. Their relation is equivalent in the new cultural context, even though “skålpund” weighs less than avoirdupois pound, and “lispund” weighs more than a stone. These translations leave the reader in peace and move the author towards “the olden days” of the North.

Lehto uses the borrowed English term “pauna” for ‘pound’, but the almost synonymous old Finnish term “naula” for ‘stone’, which seems confusing in the context of his translation with plenty of explanatory comments. The Finnish retranslation also has the same effect as the Swedish first translation, namely the hypotext is archaized and antiquated. This shows that the translators make different choices in different passages according to their translation projects. Here, it seems, Lehto’s project of translating differently from Saarikoski overrides the other aspect of his project, to do what Joyce did. As Saarikoski’s first Finnish translation of this passage was source-text oriented to the extent of offering the source text terms in translation, it motivated Lehto in this passage, translating upon the earlier translation, to go the other way toward antiquated Finnish terms. Andersson may have consulted Warburton’s ethnocentric translation and made some modernizing corrections toward the source language form.

A much more complex question is a case in which the form motivates the content of the parody. In the following example the parody is obvious and the hypotext is shared, but the motivation for the parody is in the textual form, a phonetic pun. The discussion at the bar moves on to the English navy and the revelations of “flogging on the training ships”, namely corporal punishment or what apparently was known as “rump and dozen”. The citizen proclaims the English seamen believe Britons never will be slaves but, on the contrary, they already are:

They believe in rod, the scourger almighty, creator of hell upon earth, and in Jacky Tar, the son of a gun, who was conceived of unholy boast, born of the fighting navy, suffered under rump and dozen, was scarified, flayed and curried, yelled like bloody hell, the third day he arose again from the bed, steered into haven, sitteth on his beamend till further orders whence he shall come to drudge for a living and be paid.

JJU, 270
The hypotext here is instantly recognizable in rhythm and prosody: the parody has been written on top of The Apostle’s Creed, perhaps most clearly the English translation in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer (BCP), which begins: “I believe in God the Father Almighty, / Maker of heaven and earth”. Naturally, translations of this hypotext exist and are instantly recognizable also in the target languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He uskovat raippaan, piiskuriin kaikkivaltaaseen, maanpäällisen helvetin luojaan ja Jakke Pikipöksyyn, kanuuhan poikaan, joka sikisi pöyhkeästä hengestä, syntyi taistelevasta laivastosta, kärsi perseen ja tusinan alla, leikelttiin ja peitottiin, räikäky kuin tapettava porsas, nousi kolmanteri päivänä ylös sängystään, ohjasi satamaan, istuu palkkipässä kunnes toisin määrätään ja on sieltä tuleva raatamaan ruokansa eteen ja saamaan maksun.</td>
<td>He¹ uskovat raippaan, piiskuriin kaikkivaltaaseen, maanpäällisen helvetin luojaan ja Jakke Pikipöksyyn, kanuuhan poikaan, joka sikisi epäpyhkeästä pöyhkeydestä, syntyi taistelevasta laivastosta, kärsi reisipaistin ja tusinan halitessa, viilettiin, piistiin ja räilkättiin, parkui kuin kirottu helvetti, nousi kolmanteri päivänä ylös sängystään, ohjasi satamaan, istuu nyt parrunpässä kunnes toisin määrätään ja on sieltä tuleva raatamaan elantonsa eteen ja saamaan palkkansa.¹⁴⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De tror på en flängd hud, en allsmäktig herre, skaparen av helvetet på Jorden, och på Jacky Beckbyxa, en hunds son, avlad av jämnan blandras, född av örologsarméen, som led av pisk och rumpdussin, kanonfärstes, flåddes och saltades, skrek av bara helvete, uppsteg ur kojen på tredje dagen och styrde i hamn, och sitter på sin pollare i väntan på vidare order, då han skall få jobba så han glömer om han är levande eller död.¹⁴⁹</td>
<td>De tro på hud prylgad allsmäktigt av det jordiska helvetets skapare, och på sjöbusen Jack, hans enfaldige son, vilken är avlad av en ohelig allians, född av en krigisk flotta, pinad med rumpstek och rödvin, slagen, hudflängd och flådd, nederstigen i sitt eget blod, på tredje dagen uppstånden igen från sin säng, uppstigen till masttoppen, sittande där i väntan på nya order, därifrån igenkommande till att förtjäna sitt leverne och döda.¹⁵⁰</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹¹

¹⁴⁷ PSO, 323: “They believe in crop, the whipper almighty, creator of hell upon earth, and in Jack Tar, the cannon’s son, who was conceived by a boastful spirit, born of the fighting navy, suffered under arse and dozen, was dissected, skinned and thrashed, yelled like a pig being killed, rose on the third day from his bed, steered into harbour, sits at the beamend until otherwise ordered and from thence will drudge for his food and receive payment.”

¹⁴⁸ LLU, 373: “They believe in crop, the whipper almighty, creator of hell upon earth, and in Jack Tar, the cannon’s son, who was conceived by unholy arrogance, was born of a fighting fleet, suffered roast leg and dozen, was slashed, beat and abused, cried like cursed hell, rose on the third day from his bed, steered into harbour, is now sitting at the head of the baulk until otherwise ordered and will from thence drudge for his living and be paid.”

¹⁴⁹ TWO, 316: “They believe in beaten skin, the lord almighty, the creator of hell on Earth, and in Jacky Tar, the son of a dog, conceived by damned mixture, born of the warring navy, suffered under whip and rump dozen, cannon-attached, flayed and salted, screamed like hell, on the third day he rose from his bunk and steered into harbour, and sits on his bollard waiting for further orders, and will come to work until he forgets whether he is living or dead.”

¹⁵⁰ EAU, 326: “They believe in skin flogged mightily by the creator of hell upon earth, and in the Seafarer Jack, his stupid son, who was conceived of unholy alliance, born of the fighting navy, tortured with rump steak and red wine, beaten, flogged and skinned, drenched in his own blood, on the third day resurrected from his bed, rising to the masthead, sitting there waiting for new orders, from there again to earn his living and death.”

111
The entire parody springs from the near-homonym of “rod” – ‘God’. The Finnish translations, which are here remarkably alike, do not re-create the phonetic allusion, and so the first signal of parody for the Finnish-speaking reader is “kaikkivaltiaaseen” – ‘almighty’. The Swedish translators, whether as a result of an influence from one to another or as coincidence, have been able to re-create the formal tie to “Gud” ('God') with “hud” ('skin' or 'hide'). Thomas Warburton has ‘beaten skin’ and Erik Andersson ‘skin flogged mightily’.

The same punning rewriting of almost each word of the hypotext continues throughout the passage, ending in “drudge for a living and be paid”, which alludes to “judge the quick and the dead”. The Swedish Apostle’s creed ends in the words “att döma levande och döda”. There is no pun to be made on the Swedish word for “paid” ('betald', for instance), but the translators, interpreting perhaps that here form supersedes content, rewrite the sentence so that the word ‘dead’ takes the final position: Warburton translates ‘work until he forgets whether he is living or dead’, and Andersson ‘from there again to earn his living and death’. There is no such attempt from either of the Finnish translators, but it is worth noting that even with such a few formal signals even the Finnish translations read as parodies of the Apostle’s Creed.

4.2.3. Opposition and nearness

It has already become apparent in the previous examples, that in ‘Cyclops’, the motivation, attitude, and function of Joyce’s parodies varies in a wide range. In this final subchapter on the translation of parody, I present what I perceive as the three major categories of parodic function in the episode and discuss their respective challenges in relation to the translation process. I do not suggest that there must only be one single function for a parody, but rather I envisage a sliding scale or a spectrum. Margaret A. Rose has noted that parody has been largely described as only critical, or only sympathetic, toward the parodied text, when, in fact, it can be both. In fact, according to Rose (1993, 47), parody can be playful, agitatory, engagé, blasphemous, ironic, imitative, counter-imitative, and so on. Simon Dentith defines parody based upon a parodic mode, not a particular form: “It follows from this that the functions which parody serves can vary widely, so that it is impossible to specify any single social or cultural direction for the mode” (Dentith 2000, 37). Dentith describes many
different forms that can be employed in the parodic mode: burlesque, mock-heroic, imitation, travesty. It is also significant for Dentith that there are not one or two, but a range of functions or purposes for adopting the parodic mode.

Dentith sees two major stylistic models of Ancient parodies. According to him, they can be named by the now traditional, although admittedly anachronistic, juxtaposition of mock-heroic and travesty: “Both mock-heroic (high style, low topic) and travesty (high topic, low style) can be found in relation to the great epic poet” (Dentith 2000, 40). The ancient models Dentith offers for these two traditions are the mock-epics in the style of the *paródos*, or ‘imitating singers’, whose style may be seen to have been preserved in the *Batrachomyomachia*, where the epic style is applied to the subject matter of mice and frogs. The other tradition, in Dentith’s view, stems from the Satyr plays, in which the elevated subject matters of the gods and demi-gods were treated in a ridiculing style by Satyrs, Dionysos’ companions, who were markedly earthly and grotesque beings. This relativizing tradition of the Satyrs is closer to a Bakhtinian, centrifugal view of parody.

Dentith notes that the traditions are not mutually exclusive, and there is a number of functions for parody, most of which employ humour and laughter. I would, however, especially with regard to Joyce and ‘Cyclops’, add to these two main lines of parody a third one of humoristic ludic practice, in which the functions that critique or pay homage to the hypotext, or forms of mock-heroic or travesty employed, are secondary to the naïve, ludic play with words and language. Below I present three more examples of ‘Cyclops’ to demonstrate these three parodic motivations.

The first may be called a classic mock-heroic parody, in which an elevated, epic style is imposed on a less than admirable subject matter. A case in point is the nearly Homeric description of the citizen as an Irish Hero of hyperbolic proportions:

> The widewinged nostrils, from which bristles of the same tawny hue projected, were of such capaciousness that within their cavernous obscurity the fieldlark might easily have lodged her nest. The eyes in which a tear and a smile strove ever for the mastery were of the dimensions of a goodsized cauliflower.

*JJU*, 243

This is another example of the fact that even if the specific hypotext of the parody, in this case, as Gifford & Seidman (1988, 320) comment, “late-nineteenth-century reworkings of Irish legend”, is unfamiliar to us, it may be quite easy to recognize the
parody. Changes in syntax and lexicon, and the playful hyperbole of the content, work as signals that this text is an imitation in a parodic mode, and more specifically a parodic imitation of an ancient and mythological text type. These signals have also worked as anchoring points for the Finnish and Swedish translators of the episode, whereas the specific point of allusion is bound to be unfamiliar to most of their target audience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avaraliepeiset sieraimet, joista työntyi ulos saman ruskeankellervän värisiä harjaksia, olivat sitä suurunluokkakaa, että niiden luolaiseen pimeyteen olisi levinen helposti rakentanut pesänsä. Silmät, joissa kyynel ja hymy alati kamppailivat ylivallasta, olivat hyvälaatuisen kukkakaalin kokoiset.</td>
<td>Sieraimens' laajat, harjakset joista työntyi samoten ruskeankellervät, avarat niin olivat ja paljon sisäisäns mahduttavat ette levonen luolaiseen pimeyteenä helposti pesän tehnyt oisi. Silmänsä, kyynel ja hymy joissa ehitiseen toisistansa vuoro-vuoron voiton sai, koottansa oivan kukkakaalin liin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSO, 290: “The widewinged nostrils, from which protruded out bristles of the same yellowish-brown hue, were of the magnitude that within their cavernous darkness a fieldlark could have easily built its nest. The eyes in which a tear and a smile constantly fought for mastery were the size of a quality cauliflower.”</td>
<td>LLU 338: “His nostrils wide, bristle of which protruded likewise yellowish-brown, so expansive were they that and so much within them encompassing that a fieldlark within their cavernous darkness easily a nest could have made. His eyes, tears and smile in which all the while of each other in turns victory gained, of their size equal to a good cauliflower were.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO, 286: “His wide nostrils, from which bristles of the same brown colour appeared, were so spacious that a fieldlark could easily have settled in their cavernous darkness. The eyes, in which a tear and a smile constantly fought for mastery, had the size of a magnificent cauliflower head”</td>
<td>EAU 295: “The widewinged nostrils, from which bristles of the same yellow-brown colour protruded, were so spacious that their dark cavities would have passed well for a lark to live in. The eyes in which a tear and a smile continually competed for mastery, had the measure of a larger cauliflower head.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the hypotext of the parody will be largely forgotten even for a modern English-speaking audience, and virtually unknown for Finnish and Swedish audiences, it is possible for new audiences from different languages, cultures, and contexts to read

151 Gifford & Seidman (1988, 316-20) gloss *Alfred's Itinerary*, but also “Homer’s description of Polyphemus”. In the Oxford World’s Classics *Ulysses*, Jeri Johnson (1993, 886) glosses “Homer’s description of the Cyclops”, and Weldon Thornton (1987, 259) assumes that “this probably owes something to the description of the Cyclops as being ‘like a wooded peak of the towering hills’”. This general mythological gigantism is of course a much more familiar hypotext.

152 PSO, 290: “The widewinged nostrils, from which protruded out bristles of the same yellowish-brown hue, were of the magnitude that within their cavernous darkness a fieldlark could have easily built its nest. The eyes in which a tear and a smile continuously fought for mastery were the size of a quality cauliflower.”

153 LLU 338: “His nostrils wide, bristle of which protruded likewise yellowish-brown, so expansive were they that and so much within them encompassing that a fieldlark within their cavernous darkness easily a nest could have made. His eyes, tears and smile in which all the while of each other in turns victory gained, of their size equal to a good cauliflower were.”
the inbuilt signals of ‘parodying’, ‘playfulness’, and ‘derision’, which are encoded and decoded in all the translations. Consider, for example, the heroic measurements of the citizen’s nostrils, which are given the hyperbolic extensions of a small cavern and the simile of the hero’s eye to, of all things, a “goodsized cauliflower”.

In terms of form versus content, even though at first glance it may seem that a heroic form of a legend has here been superimposed on a low subject matter of a poor drunkard at a bar, on closer inspection it becomes quite difficult to separate the transformations and imitations of style from those of content. It would be very difficult to ascribe the “bristles of the same tawny hue” projecting from the hero’s nose to either the textual world of the legend or the textual world of Barney Kiernan’s tavern, or to say whether they are a matter of content or style. In attitude this is mock-heroic, parodying a classical, lofty style with apparent respect, and showing the world described by this style lowly in comparison, but then there is also a love and understanding for the characters depicted, and an ironic distance from the style employed.

The introductory and invisible projects of the first translations by Warburton and Saarikoski are content-oriented, or to be precise, they offer a lesser amount of resistance to their target audience in their language and style. In comparison to the first translations, Andersson’s and Lehto’s retranslations into Swedish and Finnish, respectively, offer more resistance, an experience of the foreign to their target audiences, Andersson by translating all the words in comparison to Warburton, and striving for similar syntax, Lehto by following the original syntax so closely as to create a very estranging effect, to the extent of being barely readable.

The second example of parodic function is of the kind often called travesty or, let us say, parody in the tradition of the Satyr play. In this case, the function of the parody is to poke fun at the hypotext. The relativizing or even ridiculing style is applied on lofty or even pompous subject matter. In the episode, Alf Bergan thinks he has seen Patrick Dignam earlier in the day, but Joe Hynes tells him Dignam was buried that morning (as we know from the ‘Hades’ episode). This dialogue is followed by a parody of a spiritualist séance:

Interrogated as to whether life there resembled our experience in the flesh he stated that he had heard from more favoured beings now in the spirit that their
abodes were equipped with every modern home comfort such as tālāfānā, ālāvātār, hātākāldā, wātākālsāt and that the highest adepts were steeped in waves of volupty of the very purest nature.

AS GIFFORD & SEIDMAN (1988, 329) note, this passage “lampoons the style of reports published by the Society for Physical Research in London”, especially the Hinduist tantras used by the Theosophists and spiritualists, and by extension the preeminent Irish writers of the time, led by W. B. Yeats. The specific allusions to culture and period could presumably be difficult to render in a new context. However the function, exaggerating and ridiculing some aspects of the hypotext, seems to translate quite readily:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiedusteltaessa häneltä, muistuttitko elämä siellä meidän kokemuksiemme lihassa, hän totesi, että oli kuullut parempiosaisilta olennoilta, jotka nyt olivat hengessä, että heidän asuinsijansa olivat varustetut kaikin nykyaikaisen kodin lukuvuksin, joista mainittakoon talahwaana, alawattora, kalma ja lamman vasa sekä waacaa, sekä että korkeammat adeptit piehtaroivat kaikkein puhtaimman lajisen nautinnon laineissa. 156</td>
<td>Tiedusteltaessa muistuttitko elämä siellä meidän kokemuksiemme lihassa hän totesi kuulleen parempiosaisilta olennoilta jotka nyt olivat hengessä että heidän asuinsijansa olivat varustetut kaikin nykyaikaisen kodin lukuvuksin, joista mainittakoon talahwaana, ālāvātārā, hātākāldā, wātākālsāt sekä että korkeimmat adeptit piehtaroivat kaikkein puhtaimman nautinnon aalloissa. 157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>När man frågade honom huruvida livet I hans värld liknade vår erfarenhet i köttet sade han sig ha erfart av lyckligare väsen att deras boningar voro utrustade med varje slag av modern heminredning, som till exempel tālāfānā, ālāvātār, hātākāldā, wātākālsāt, samt att de högsta adepterna dränktes i vågor av den renaste vällust. 158</td>
<td>Tillfrågad om huruvida livet där påminde om våra erfarenheter i köttet meddelade han att han hört från mer gynnade existenser som nu var i anden att deras boningar var utrustade med alla moderna bekvämligheter såsom tālāfānā, bādārāmā, vārmāvātān, klāsāt, och att de</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

156 PSO, 296: “When it was inquired of him, whether life there resembled our experiences in the flesh, he stated that he had heard from the better-off beings, who were now in the spirit, that their habitations were equipped with all the comforts of modern home, such as talafana, alawator, hat and cold watar and watarcasat, and that the highest adepts wallowed in the waves of pleasure of the most pure kind.”

157 LLU, 344: “Interrogated whether life there resembled our experiences in the flesh, he stated that he had heard from better-off beings who were now in the spirit that their habitations were equipped with all the comforts of modern home, such as talafana, alavatar, hat and cold watar, watarcasat and that the highest adepts were wallowing in waves of most pure pleasure.

158 TWO, 291: “When he was asked whether life in his world resembled our experience in the flesh, he said he had learned from happier beings that their habitations were equipped with every kind of modern home furnishings, such as talafana, alavatar, hatakald, watalkalsat, and that the highest adepts were submersed in waves of the purest pleasure.”
The parodic mode is easy to recognize in all the translations. The specific target of the ridicule may remain unclear to all but Lehto’s readers, who benefit from an explanatory footnote, but the style of the parodied text will remind most readers of various pseudo-Eastern spiritual or New Age discourses. What draws one’s attention, first of all, are the graphemes ‘a’ with a macron, representing the open back unrounded vowel in Sanskrit transliteration. In the original 1922 Shakespeare and Company Ulysses the macrons were omitted, but in the 1986 Gabler edition they return. At first sight it would appear Saarikoski has translated from an edition without the macrons, because they are missing from his translation. However, on closer inspection, the long Finnish ‘aa’ vowel abounds in the translation, which may be a way of translating the Sanskrit transliteration of an elongated vowel into Finnish. Another possibility is that he has misconstrued the hypotext, since he also chooses archaic terms for his translation, and adds ‘w’ instead of ‘v’, which functions as a signal of “antiquated” language. The overall feel of the first Finnish translation is “old-fashioned”, which is a possible contrast to the original gist of the “highest adepts” having “every modern home comfort”.

Lehto’s target text has the explicit signals of Sanskrit transliteration, and no unnecessary ‘w’s, but he chooses such strange Finnish equivalents for the English terms that I am not sure all of his readers will get the joke. Andersson seems to recognize this problem and substitutes “bäddrämm” (‘badrum’ – bathroom) for “älavätär” (an ‘elevator’ or ‘a lavatory’), for instance. Warburton has left the terms as it is, almost as if the terms were actually in Sanskrit. Hence the process of transfer of this passage to a new language moves from what is one’s own towards that which is foreign in Finnish, but from the strange and the foreign towards a “Swedish Joyce” in Swedish.

159 EAU, 300: “Inquired whether life there resembled our experiences in the flesh, he announced that he heard from more favoured beings now in the spirit that their habitations were equipped with all modern conveniences such as täläfnä, bädräm, wärmwätär, clásät, and that the highest adepts were in possession of the highest extravagance.

160 The macrons do appear in the Bodley Head Ulysses, which I have suggested was Saarikoski’s main source text, as well as the first version of Warburton’s Swedish translation of 1946, which was most certainly one of the five different translations Saarikoski consulted for his translation.
Let us now consider the third mode I suggested as a function of parody in ‘Cyclops’. In Joyce’s parodies it is often very hard to ascribe the function of the parody to either critique toward the hypotext or satire toward modern society. The motivation behind most of these parodies is relativizing, ludic play with language. Joyce’s play with modern phenomena and styles is ambivalent: He is critical, yet he accepts them as they are. The men gathered at the bar discuss the deforestation of Ireland. The passage that follows is an ironic comment on another level of discourse: a society column describing a wedding in which everything also alludes to trees and forestry. The passage is another good example of the gargantuan, hyperbolic lists of grotesque proportions typical to this episode.

The fashionable international world attended en masse this afternoon at the wedding of the chevalier Jean Wyse de Neaulan, grand high chief ranger of the Irish National Foresters, with Miss Fir Conifer of Pine Valley. Lady Sylvester Elmshade, Mrs Barbara Lovebirch, Mrs Poll Ash, Mrs Holly Hazeleys, Miss Daphne Bays, Miss Dorothy Canebrake, Mrs Clyde Twelvetrees, Mrs Rowan Greene, Mrs Helen Vinegadding, Miss Virginia Creeper, Miss Gladys Beech, Miss Olive Garth, Miss Blanche Maple, Mrs Maud Mahogany, Miss Myra Myrtle, Miss Priscilla Elderflower, Miss Bee Honesuckle, Miss Grace Poplar, Miss O Mimosa San, Miss Rachel Cedarfrond, the Misses Lilian and Viola Lilac, Miss Timidity Aspenall, Mrs Kitty Dewey-Mosse, Miss May Hawthorne, Mrs Gloriana Palm, Mrs Liana Forrest, Mrs Arabella Blackwood and Mrs Norma Holyoake of Oakholme Regis graced the ceremony by their presence. (JJU, 268)

This parody evokes several textual worlds simultaneously. There is the verbose and prissy style of the magazine society article, the running joke on trees and forestry, and, as Lehto notes in his footnote, a possible allusion to lists of trees in Spenser’s Faerie Queene and Chaucer’s Parlement of Foules. The allusions seem hopeless to re-create, but the ludic practice of the parody allows the translators to come in and take part in the play. The ones that accept the invitation seem to fare best. Let us, for the sake of brevity, focus on translations and backtranslation of just a few lines:

WARBURTON
Den internationella societen övervar en masse dagens kyrkvigsel mellan kavaljer Jean Wyse de Neaulan, Stormästare för de Iriska Skogsmännen, och Jungfru Grana Conifer till Furudal. Grevinnan Sylvester Almbladh, fru Barbara Bjorkstam[...]
TWO, 314
Backtranslation: “The international society attended en masse today’s wedding between cavalier Jean Wyse de Neaulan, Grandmaster of Irish Foresters, and Ms Grana Conifera to Pinewood valley. Countess Sylvester Elmleaf, Mrs Barbara Birchstem[...]

Warburton’s translation is certainly very ethnocentric here. He “Swedicizes” titles and proper names, and conveys the forestal references quite freely. “Elmshade” becomes ‘Elmleaf’, and “Lovebirch” - ‘Birchstem’. The feel of the society column remains, however, and the jokes work effortlessly in their new context.

SAARIKOSKI
Kansainvälisten seurapiirien kerma en masse oli läsnä tänään iltapäivällä, kun avioliittoon vihittiin ritari Jean Wyse de Neoulanen, Irlannin Kansallisen Matsähoidintaliiton ylipääsuurmetsänvartiota, ja neiti Cuusia Conifer Mäntylääksosta. Rouva Sylvester Jalavainen, rouva Barbara Koivulempi[...]

Backtranslation: “The international high society en masse was present this afternoon, when the knight Jean Wyse de Needle, the highovermasterranger of the Irish National Foresters, and Ms Fir Conifer of Pine Valley were married. Mrs Sylvester Elm, Mrs Barbara Birchlove[...]

Saarikoski’s translation is a step towards the foreign from Warburton. The “grand high chief ranger” Jean Wyse is a 'highovermasterranger', and “Mrs Barbara Lovebirch” is ‘Mrs Barbara Birchlove’. “Chevalier” is translated as 'knight', which is correct in denotation, but in connotation conveys less a sense of a French high nobleman, and more of a feudal man-at-arms.161

ANDERSSON
Uppslutningen från den fina internationella världen var en masse denna eftermiddag då friherren Johan Wise af Nolan, högste storskogsvaktare vid Irlandskas skogsvårdsstyrelsen, förmäldes med fröken Gran Städsegrön från Furudalen. Grevinnan fru Sylvia Almsugga, fru Barbara Björkhänge[...]

Backtranslation: “Attendance from the fine international world was en masse this afternoon as Johan Wise of Nolan, esquire, the high grandchief ranger at the Irish Forestry Board, was married to Ms Fir Evergreen from Pinewood valley. Countess Mrs Sylvia Elmshade, Mrs Barbara Birchpendant[...]

161 Further down, for “Mrs Norma Holyoake of Oakholme Regis”, Saarikoski translates “rouva Olava Honka Honkanummelta” (“Mrs Olava Pinetree from Pinemoor”), in a curious topical reference apparently to Chancellor of Justice Olavi Honka, who had run for President of Finland in 1962 against the incumbent Urho Kekkonen (in office 1956–82), but eventually dropped his candidacy.
Changing the French or Norman nobiliary particle “de” to “af” in “friherren Johan Wise af Nolan” turns the ‘grandchiefranger’ into old Swedish nobility in Andersson’s translation. “Lady Sylvester” goes by her own, female first name of “Sylvia”, in keeping with Swedish practice. Overall the feel of the Swedish retranslation is “Joyce risen out of the Swedish literary terroir” (cf. Berman 2009, 98-9), even though the translation is formally more source-oriented than the first translation.

In the footnotes Lehto explains the parody and the possible allusions to Spenser, Chaucer, and Ovid. He also largely translates Gifford & Seidman’s (1988, 353-354) notes on the passage about the symbolic meanings of the plants mentioned. These notes also inform and complicate his translation proper. The Finnish retranslation may definitely be called more estranging than the first translation, but one feels some of the ludic play and ambivalent function of the passage is lost, as the reader “weeds through” Lehto’s oblique translation and its twenty-seven footnotes.

4.3. The weighty lightness of laughter

In his 1980 essay “The Comic and the Rule”, semiotician Umberto Eco discusses a crude but central question of the comic: The fact that the tragic seems, generally speaking, timeless and universal, but the “comic, on the other hand, seems bound to its time, society, cultural anthropology” (Eco 1986, 269). This is an intuitively recognizable divide: one finds it easier to sympathize with an ancient tragic hero than laugh with ancient comic characters. It is easier to appreciate, for instance, Japanese drama or tragedy than Japanese comedy.

The question that arises regarding translation is whether this means that the tragic is easier to translate than the comic? Can tragedy be carried over as such, while
comedy must be re-created to have the desired effect? Eco also points out that in order to appreciate comedy the audience needs to be more cultivated than for tragedy: “Even without knowing the accusation against him, we suffer as Socrates dies slowly from the feet toward the heart, whereas without a degree in classics we don’t know exactly why the Socrates of Aristophanes should make us laugh” (Eco 1986, 270). It would certainly seem, from a reading of *Ulysses* and ‘Cyclops’, that to appreciate the comic one needs a wider context, while the tragic is more individual and intuitive.

Can the comic and laughter be centrifugal, relativizing, and democratic, as I have suggested, if it demands such a highly cultivated audience to appreciate it? This is an especially poignant question in the case of translation. If one wants to be inclusive and democratic, one has to explain the joke, and, proverbially, a joke explained is no longer comic. If one wants to create laughter without explanation, one presumably needs to rewrite the parody ethnocentrically in the new context - and thus give it the likeness of the same, destroying what is foreign and strange in the original.

This brings us back to the instrumentalist question of translation: What is to be carried over? The form? The content? The effect? In his 1923 essay “The Task of the Translator”, Walter Benjamin argues against the aesthetic of communicative translation, of translating “the essence” of the source text. Benjamin asks, what is the essence of the source text? What does a piece of fine writing communicate: “Essentially, it is neither communication nor statement” (Benjamin 2009, 29). Nor does Benjamin (2009, 30) think a target text is required to serve the target language reader: “But if the translation were aimed at the reader, so too must the original have been. If the original does not exist for the reader’s sake, how shall the translation be understood on the basis of that relationship.” Benjamin’s call is for source-oriented, non-communicative translation, which asks of the original how the work itself admits itself to be translated. This can be seen in the background of the translation aesthetics of the Finnish and Swedish retranslations of ‘Cyclops’, especially and quite clearly Lehto’s self-aware and visible Finnish retranslation.  

In his essay on the comic, Eco suggests a preliminary explanation to the universality of tragedy, and the particularity and locality of the comic. He argues that

---

162 It may be worth noting that Leevi Lehto also translated Walter Benjamin’s essay on translation to the 2007 Finnish anthology on classic writings on translation theory, *Kääntökirja* (Tapani Kilpeläinen, Ed.).
whereas the tragic states and upholds the rule that is tragically violated, comedy does
not even mention the rule that is comically broken: “There exists a rhetorical device,
which concerns the figures of thought, in which, given a social or intertextual ‘frame’
or scenario already known to the audience, you display the variation without, however,
making it explicit in discourse” (Eco 1986, 272). Irony, stating the opposite of what is
believed socially, works if the opposite is not mentioned. Comedy is comic if the rule
it violates is not stated but is understood implicitly.

With reference to ‘Cyclops’, the “rule” can be understood as an intertextual
scenario or a genre. To enjoy the violation, one must implicitly understand the genre.
Eco considers the democratic and undemocratic aspects of such comedy: “The comic
seems to belong to the people, liberating, subversive, because it gives license to violate
the rule. But it gives such license precisely to those who have so absorbed the rule that
they also presume it is inviolable” (Eco 1986, 275). In order to enjoy the
subversiveness of Joyce’s parodies, the reader must belong to a culturally very narrow
and specific target group, or otherwise be widely cultivated or consult annotations and
reading companions.

In this chapter I have analysed the Finnish and Swedish translations of the parodies of
the ‘Cyclops’ episode of Ulysses. I found various uses of parody in Joyce’s text, and,
correspondingly, various subspecies of comic. I offered a definition of parody above,
which includes (contrary to some strictly postmodern or intertextual definitions of
parody) the comic, as well as humorous effect. Parody is an imitative and
transformative intertextual strategy between textual worlds employed for a number of
functions ranging from ludic irony to satire, and creating a comic or ambivalent
incongruity.

By my definition I wanted to emphasize that parody must be recognizably
imitative of its hypotext, but also recognizably transformative, and by the use of the
term ‘intertextuality’ I placed my definition of parody in the field of intertextual
relations, along with related terms such as ‘pastiche’. Defining parody as ‘strategy’, I
highlighted the requirement of authorial intention, and by ‘textual worlds’ I wanted to
communicate the “broadness” of parody compared to, for example, pastiche, which
will be discussed more extensively in chapter 5.
The requirement or allowance of a ‘range of functions’ in my definition of parody allows for considerations and analysis of seemingly very different uses of parody from mock-heroic to travesty to – what I saw as quite typical of Joyce’s parodies in the ‘Cyclops’ – ludic play with genres, forms, and language. The mention of ‘comic or ambivalent incongruity’ is meant to account for the usual effect of reading parody, the preparatory feeling of nonconformity, discordance, conflict, which may result through recognition in comic or ambivalent effects.

In my analysis of the parodies of ‘Cyclops’, I found cases of critical parody, in which the lofty literary style adopted was ridiculed through exaggeration and hyperbole. In these cases there was a tendency to simultaneously satirize the one-eyed and short-sighted, often nationalistic, thoughts and assumptions behind the discourse. This mode I called, after its classical predecessors, the mode of travesty. In this form of parody the elevated style of the epic or the tragedy is brought down to earth. At other times the parodies took the form of the classical mock-heroic, in which the imitated elevated form is treated with respect, and the “butt of the joke” is the trivial or lowly modern incident or phenomenon to which the elevated style is applied.

The major mode of the parodies of ‘Cyclops’ is the ludic, ambivalent and playful. In most cases there is no clear-cut “target” of the parodies, either in the textual world of the hypotext or the context of the surrounding society, but rather the ludic imitations of the genres and text types relativize all text types and narration, and create a general ambivalent quality to the entire narration of the episode. To the translator the deciphering and re-coding of these encoded modes of narration is essential for the re-creation of the parodic work for the readers of their target texts.

I applied my polyphonic view on translation to the analysis of the translations of the parodic structure, concentrating on, in Antoine Berman’s terms, the process of transfer of the work to a new language and culture in translations and retranslations. The Finnish and Swedish (re)translations of the parodies of the ‘Cyclops’ episode seemed to confirm to an extent Berman’s view that first translations tend to be introductory and assimilative, and in retranslation the relationship to the strange and the foreign in the original is re-evaluated. In the first of the Swedish and Finnish Ulysses translations, Warburton’s Olysses, there was an invisible, content-oriented, and ethnocentric translation project. When in the parody passages of ‘Cyclops’ there was a choice to be made between more formally foreign translation, and an invisible,
idiomatic communication towards the target language, Warburton favoured the latter. The effect this seemed to create in the translation was to emphasize the simple, ludic, comic nature of the episode, but downplay its intertextually complex and subversive nature.

Saarikoski’s first Finnish translation project of the parodies of ‘Cyclops’ was to re-create in its own literary horizon the ambivalent and ludic play of language that Saarikoski has clearly interpreted as the central aspect of Joyce’s work. However, planting this aspect invisibly and instrumentally in the Finnish literary horizon of the 1960s, Saarikoski at times fails to meet the foreign of Joyce’s work in its political and cultural specificity, and to re-create Joyce’s parodies in all their complexity. Whereas in Warburton there was the occasional tendency to “work around” difficult passages, Saarikoski’s greatest strength is in conveying the humour of the episode.

The retranslations, in terms of Bollettieri and Torresi ‘reforeignize’, or in Berman’s terms re-evaluate the native strangeness of the work and join it with the strangeness in the foreign language to different degrees. Andersson’s Swedish retranslation is a mix of satire toward pretentious text types and the ludic and the comic. Lehto’s Finnish retranslation is foreignizing to the extent of emphasizing serious satire at the expense of ambivalent parody.

According to Walter Benjamin (2009, 34), the “truth” of retranslation is that “while the literary text lives on in its own language, even the greatest translation is doomed to wither as its language grows and to die in the renewed version.” With this, I have to disagree. Whether the cacophonic, cantankerous voices of the Finnish first translation and retranslation of the ‘Cyclops’ episode of Ulysses, or the harmonious, additive voices of the Swedish first translator and retranslator, the retranslation has not simply surpassed or killed it. Instead the retranslations have renewed not only the source text but also the first translations for Finnish and Swedish-speaking audiences, and the polyphony of the four translations have created a multi-faceted and rich Swedish-Finnish ‘Cyclops’ macrotext, in which the work can go on living beyond itself in the hermeneutic process of the translations.

I further analysed three different aspects of re-created parodies in the translated ‘Cyclops’. The first problematic was the question of the recognition of parody in the translated text. In this section, I adopted Margaret A. Rose’s term ‘signals’ for the signs coded into the parody text by the author, which are to be decoded by the reader of the
source text. Signals such as hyperbole or changes in the syntax and lexicon in the narration of the text work as triggers for parodic reading and de-coding for the readers of the source text, and as anchoring points for the translators for the re-coding of the target text. It was noted that even if the specific hypotext or target of the parody was left unspecific for the reader of the target text due to the unfamiliar cultural or temporal context, the parodic signals of ludic play and comic nature aided the translators in conveying the parodic mode.

Secondly, I considered the question of form versus content, parody as the imitation of style and subject matter. The general conclusion was that in parody the hypertext imitates and reshapes equally the form and content of its hypotext. The question regarding form versus content is how will a first translator or a retranslator approach a parody transforming style, or a parody transforming content? It could be seen that the choices the translators made in individual parody passages differed not only from each other, but also in their own choices in other passages, depending on the overriding strategy or project of their translation of the entire episode.

The third and final aspect considered was the aspect of opposition and nearness, the question of the attitude of the parodist. It is a central question to a translator and a retranslator of a work to form a view why parody has been chosen as a textual strategy. As previously stated, generally three different attitudes of the parodic mode could be found in the ‘Cyclops’ episode of *Ulysses*: the critical or ridiculing *travesty* towards its hypotext, the respectful *mock-heroic* parody of a hypotext with satirical intentions towards modern society, and the ambivalent or playful mode of *ludic practice* between these two poles.

The parodies, the comic, and the laughter of ‘Cyclops’ is at its core something much more fundamental than criticism towards certain types of uses of language or satire towards certain phenomena in the surrounding culture and society. The parodies of the ‘Cyclops’, read as a whole, are all-encompassing, fundamental, and essentially relativizing. They possess the weighty lightness of laughter.
“A pregnant word”

Pastiche in ‘Oxen of the Sun’

In episode 14 of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, ‘Oxen of the Sun’, after spending the twilight-hour on the beach with Gerty MacDowell, Leopold Bloom arrives at a lying-in hospital in Holles Street, where he has heard Mrs Purefoy is having an extremely difficult childbirth. At the hospital common-room Bloom finds Stephen Dedalus and a group of young medical students sharing drinks, sardines, and noisy double entendres. In due time the baby is delivered, and the medical students take their party to Burke’s public house. Not much happens in the chapter, this is very much an episode of style and technique of narration. The episode begins with the monosyllabic trot of Old English and follows in chronological progression the stylistic development of English prose style.

The Homeric referent of the ‘Oxen of the Sun’ is the very end of Book XII of Homer’s *Odyssey*. Odysseus and the remainder of his crew, those who survived Scylla and Charybdis, are in dire need of rest and nourishment. They come to an island, where the Sun God Helios grazes his seven herds of sacred oxen. Odysseus remembers that Circe and Teiresias bade him not to harm the cattle of the god, but while he is away, his hungry crew kills and eats the livestock. For Joyce, “the Oxen of the Sun are symbols of fertility” (Gilbert 1955, 297), and their slaughter was a sin against fertility - comparable to birth control or “sterilizing the act of coition”.

Correspondingly, in the Gilbert schema the “Organ” of this episode is the ‘womb’, the “Art” is ‘medicine’, and the “Technic” is ‘embryonic development’. Embryonic development as a literary technique turns out to be a sequence of stylistic imitations following the development of English prose style. There is no initial or basic narrative style in this episode, from which the parodies or pastiches could be separated, but it is a developing, morphing collage.
Embryonic ‘development’ may be a slightly misleading term. Although the chapter begins with an almost unreadable imitation of “bad translations” of Latin texts into English and rises to the heights of the prose of Pater and Newman, it also ends with drunken gibberish at Burke’s. No real progress seems to have been made. All in all, the question of Joyce’s attitude toward his literary ancestors is of interest here: Does Joyce want to link his own book into a “great tradition”, or does he want to outdo the famous English prose writers of the past? Is this a confession of influence or anxiety of influence, an attempt to rid oneself of all influence? It may also be that Joyce, an Irishman who could not write in Irish, saw in the English of the empire an oppressor of his native land. A self-proclaimed nomad with no language to call home, he sought to slaughter the previous English prose, just as Odysseus’s crew slaughtered the oxen of the Sun.

In what follows I study the translations of pastiche, stylistic imitation, in the ‘Oxen of the Sun’ episode. I attempt to answer a few central questions relating to stylistic imitation, pastiche, and the imitation of that imitation, translation. The polyphonic view on translation further complicates this intertextual progression, as later retranslations are aware of former imitations, and on the other hand the earlier translations are re-written by their predecessors, just as they re-wrote the original novel. In this chapter I study how the translator spots a hypotext in a source text, and how the target reader can decipher that hypotext from the target text. I have used the analytical methods of the digital humanities, and by use of tag words and structures attempted to explicate the elusive implicit sense of a palimpsest: how can we demonstrate there is a hypotext to this hypertext?

It is also important not only to point out and study Joyce’s allusions, pastiches, and hypotexts, but to also consider why he has chosen this strategy for the source text. Why has the intertextual nature of this text been made so explicit that a reader will abandon conventional reading strategies and look for an intertextual context? Why, on the other hand, has the intertextual nature not been made explicit enough for a reader to reconstruct the context without the aid of commentaries and research literature? What is the motivation of this technique? And, relating to that question and central to my study, I consider how the Finnish and Swedish translators approach this strategy and technique, and what is the afterlife of this episode in Finnish and Swedish. What of this intertextual strategy have the translators considered relevant to re-create in their
translation projects in a different time and cultural context, and what is the technique of their co-creations?\footnote{Nyqvist (2010, 181) poses this question in her study on the history and theory of pastiche in literature: “[H]ow is it possible to translate a pastiche from one language to another, when in addition to imitating an imitation the translator must also try to mediate its cultural trail?”}

The first question was to consider why Joyce chose such a strategy for the source text. If we make an allowance for authorial intention, we have some paratextual clues. One is according to Ellmann (1965, 309) in a letter from Joyce to Frank Budgen, where the author states that in ‘Oxen’ Stephen Dedalus, the portrait of the artist as a young man, whom Joyce created in his writing, making him his own father, is “again the embryo”. In other words, it would seem Joyce considered he re-created, gave birth, to his own image in ‘Oxen’ out of all the textual material he is composed of. Ellmann (ibid.) also sees in this the parody of the method of A Portrait: “Stephen emerges not to life but to Burke’s pub.”

Ellmann (1965, 489) relates that Joyce considered ‘Oxen’ to be “the most difficult episode in an odyssey […] both to interpret and to execute”. In the “execution” he studied both the ontogeny of a foetus and the literary historian and scholar George Saintsbury’s A History of English Prose Rhythm (1912). In another letter to Budgen he delineated his plans for the episode: the crime against fecundity, the evolving technique from Anglo-Saxon to “a frightful jumble of Pidgin English, […] Cockney, Irish, Bowery slang and broken doggerel” (Ellmann 1965, 490), and finally the casting of Bloom as “the spermatozoon, the hospital the womb, the nurse the ovum, Stephen the embryo. How’s that for high?” (ibid.).

Whether Joyce’s aim was to match, surpass or execute the history of English prose, the second question remains: How do the Finnish and Swedish translators imitate Joyce’s pastiches, and which elements of this intertextual strategy have they considered relevant to re-create in a different time and cultural context? In translating pastiche, especially such an extensive and complex pastiche as ‘Oxen’, a translator must both recognize the hypotext and consider the significance of its use in the source text, and then make a choice as to how to re-create this Other within a text in his translation. Retranslations and translations rewrite the source text quite similarly as the source text rewrites its hypotexts. Translation is a part of a cycle of cultural reproduction, as Antoine Berman (1992, 64) comments: “This phenomenon is in turn
reproduced on all levels of cultural translation (criticism, borrowings, ‘influences,’ etc.).” Berman, with reference to Goethe and “World Literature”, sees translation and criticism as a part of a wider phenomenon of Classical and Romantic intertextuality.

In the polyphonic approach to the comparative literary study of (re)translations of *Ulysses*, translation is studied as a part of a polyphonic sequence of rewritings. It is therefore also of interest to study the dialogue between translations and retranslations, and how they negotiate the hermeneutic interpretations of the source text in their literary and aesthetic horizons. The fact that first translations have a certain translation project, and are aimed at specific horizons of the translator, create a need and possibility for later re-interpretations with different projects and horizons. As Berman (2009, 78) notes with regard to his project of productive criticism, “a translation [...] imperatively calls for a retranslation”. Different interpretations with divergent projects enrich the “translation macrotext” within a language area, and ultimately the inaccessible polyglot macrotext of all the translations of the work.\footnote{O’Neill (2005, 10, italics in the original) has briefly considered the question of authority in his macrotextual model: “For [...] the macrotextual model, all the possible translations combine with their original to constitute a new but ultimately inaccessible ‘original’ – authority recentred in the polyglot text.”}

In this chapter I compare the translators’ strategies in the ‘Oxen’ episode to the overall projects I suggested for them in chapter 3: that the overall prevailing project of Thomas Warburton’s first translation of *Ulysses* into Swedish is an introductory and invisible one with aspects of a philological translation; that Pentti Saarikoski’s first Finnish translation project is a mixture of invisible and philological translation, which freely partakes in ludic play in the intertextual episodes; that Erik Andersson’s Swedish retranslation project is a quite scholarly translation, which attempts to invisibly, yet creatively offer his readers a ‘Swedish Joyce’; that in Leevi Lehto’s Finnish retranslation project the strategies of ‘doing what Joyce did’ and ‘not doing what Saarikoski did’ compete.

But before presenting the analysis it is necessary to consider the special case of pastiche as an intertextual form.
5.1. Word, dialogue, and pastiche

Pastiche, as a literary form, is generally considered a more respectful form of imitation than the more critical or deriding parody. Pastiche is more ambivalent, and its function in a text may not be as clear to determine. Both parody and pastiche are imitative strategies that explicitly bring out the implicit dialogism or intertextuality of all writing. To understand Joyce’s playful intertextuality in ‘Oxen’, his collage of stylistic pastiches, and to study the imitations of those imitations in the Finnish and Swedish translations of the episode, we can once again look at the notions of Bakhtin’s *dialogism* and the *polyphonic novel.*

Bakhtin does not use the term ‘pastiche’, but a similar practice may be seen in his description of ‘parodic stylization’ and *skaz*-narration. For Bakhtin, there are two forces at work in literature: *Centripetal* unifying forces aim to conform and purify language, and *centrifugal* forces constantly try to break old rules and create new forms. These forces are not mutually exclusive, but can coexist in a single text, even in a single sentence. Poetry, the epic, and the language of politics and science have, in Bakhtin’s view, developed within the monologic realm of the centripetal forces (essentially those who have in the society the power to determine what is normative and what marginal). On the other hand, the heterogeneous voices of centrifugal forces have been able to penetrate into literature through the historically less-valued art of prose fiction. The novel is for Bakhtin an especially dialogical form, in which the irreverent, mocking and subversive tradition of Menippean satire has survived, originating in the carnivalistic laughter of the common people of the medieval marketplace.

It is unlikely that Bakhtin, writing his book on Dostoevsky’s poetics in 1929 in Leningrad, and his next study on “Discourse in the Novel” after a six-year exile in Kazakhstan, ending in 1936, would have had access to Joyce’s *Ulysses*, but it feels likely that in this novel, and especially in ‘Oxen’, Bakhtin would have seen a more explicit manifestation of the centrifugal power of dialogism through the use of

---

165 Bakhtin discusses this in the context of Dostoevsky’s poetics: “In *The Double*, a parodic stylization of the ‘high style’ from *Dead Souls* is refracted through the narrator’s voice.” (Bakhtin 1984, 226).

166 See “Discourse in the Novel”: “Every utterance participates in the ‘unitary language’ (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia” (Bakhtin 1981a, 272).
another’s words than in Dostoevsky’s novels, something not far from the carnivalistic anarchy of François Rabelais’s *Gargantua* and *Pantagruel*, the topic of Bakhtin’s PhD thesis.

In her 1966 article “Word, Dialogue and Novel” (‘Le mot, le dialogue et le roman’), Julia Kristeva brought Bakhtin’s thought into the realm of Western scholarship, arguing that after Bakhtin a written word can be seen as a point of crossing of textual surfaces, a dialogue of different texts. The basic nature of a text is double - *écriture-lecture* - both writing and a reading of previous texts. This *other* logic, resisting the epic Aristotelian either-or logic, is, in Kristeva’s terms, *carnivalesque dialogism*. For Kristeva, the novel that incorporates a carnivalesque structure is called polyphonic, and to Bakhtin’s examples of Rabelais, Swift and Dostoevsky she adds Joyce, Proust and Kafka.  

For Kristeva, signification takes place in a *space* with three dimensions: the writer, the reader, and context: “The word’s status is thus defined *horizontally* (the word in the text belongs to both writing subject and addressee) as well as *vertically* (the word in the text is oriented towards an anterior or synchronic literary corpus)” (Kristeva 1986, 37). The writing subject loses his autonomy and gives way to ambivalent *writing*. This is what is highlighted in the pastiches of ‘Oxen’. Who is the writer of this episode? In chapter 2 I defined translating in my Polyphonic Translation Model, somewhat as Kristeva defines intertextual writing, as a form of (re)reading and (re)writing. In the translations of ‘Oxen’, even more so than in all translation, the question becomes more explicit: Who is *writing* the translation?

In her book on the theory and practice of pastiche, Nyqvist (2010, 124) discerns two different conceptions of pastiche: The first stems from a tradition originating in French art criticism at the turn of the 17*th* and 18*th* centuries, which was applied to literature: “the acknowledged imitation of the individual style of another writer”. In this tradition pastiche is understood as a text that another writer could have, but did not, write. What separates this understanding of pastiche from plagiarism is what Gérard Genette calls the *pastiche contract*: pastiche as acknowledged imitation

---

167 Joyce’s special brand of polyphonic novel Kristeva deems “unreadable”: “[W]hile dialogue in Rabelais, Swift and Dostoevsky remains at a representative, fictitious level, our century’s polyphonic novel becomes ‘unreadable’ (Joyce) and interior to language (Proust, Kafka)” (Kristeva 1986, 42).
explicitly discloses the text or author it is imitating, whereas plagiarism naturally does not.168

The other, more recent conception stems from the Anglophone pastiche of Anglo-American postmodernism. In this tradition, pastiche is understood as an eclectic collage or montage of different influences, reflecting the Italian origin of the word as a culinary term, pasticcio, referring to a pastry composed of mixed ingredients. In Fredric Jameson’s view, pastiche becomes the cultural logic of capitalism, where old styles are re-used eclectically and unacknowledged: “[I]n Jamesonian postmodernism [...] pastiche becomes a dominant cultural principle: the crisis of representation has made individual styles impossible, leaving imitation as the only option for writers” (Nyqvist 2010, 127). Jameson’s view of pastiche is decidedly negative. For Jameson parody, a form of imitation implying a moral judgement, has been replaced in the era of postmodernism and late capitalism by pastiche, a collage without a normative grounding.169 It is not necessary to view the collage-based conception of pastiche as negatively and politically as Jameson. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that for Jameson, what we call Joyce’s pastiches in the ‘Oxen’ episode are in fact parodies, coinciding with his notion of modernism, and Joyce as a modernist.170

In her study, Nyqvist offers a terminological solution to this historical and conceptual discrepancy. Nyqvist proposes that the eclectic notion of pastiche should be called a compilation pastiche, and the imitation of recognizable style should be termed stylistic pastiche:

Thus compilation pastiche could be used of eclectic works which borrow and amend elements from different sources or incorporate features from diverse styles, while those pastiches which imitate the style of one identifiable source could be called stylistic pastiches.

Nyqvist 2010, 135

---

168 Genette (1997, 128) acknowledges Philippe Lejeune’s autobiography contract as the inspiration of the term.
170 For Jameson, Joyce is a monument of high modernism, and therefore an example of individual voice and stylistic parody: “The disappearance of the individual subject, along with its formal consequence, the increasing unavailability of the personal style, engender the well-nigh universal practice today of what may be called pastiche. […] To be sure, parody found a fertile area in the idiosyncrasies of the moderns and their ‘imitable’ styles” (Jameson 1991, 16). However, Joyce’s strategy of using a collage of stylistic imitations to call any ‘style’ or narratorial ‘voice’ into question, seems, in Jameson’s terms, a postmodern use of pastiche.
In a compilation pastiche, then, the text connects elements from different sources in, as it were, a collage, creating a new work of art which can be alienating in appearance, and call for a new, more conceptual strategy of reading. This could be seen as an explicit form of the Bakhtinian-Kristevian implicit intertextuality of novel, literature and language.

The nature of a stylistic pastiche is more complicated than it perhaps seems at first. A stylistic pastiche must resemble the model it imitates in order to be recognizable, but it must also have critical differences to its model so as not to be a plagiarism or a copy, but an imitation. Nyqvist (2010, 157) suggests the referent of a stylistic pastiche is not a specific style, but an abstract model or an impression of that style: “[T]he style imitated in a stylistic pastiche is not, strictly speaking, the actual objective style of the source text, but an impression or an image of that style.” Stylistic pastiche is an ambivalent form, or, in Bakhtin’s terms, a polyphonic utterance: it internalizes both the monologic word and the dialogic word of another. Nyqvist (2010, 174–196) considers parody and pastiche to belong to a continuum of imitative strategies. Parody tends to be broader, and does not need a specific referent, whereas pastiche is more specific, and requires a recognizable model.

Thus, I argue that in the ‘Oxen’ episode of *Ulysses*, we have a compilation pastiche composed of chronologically successive stylistic pastiches. It is important to note that in this respect the reading of the episode has changed over time. Originally, the episode must have been read more as a compilation pastiche, alienating and strange, with the archaic style, at first almost unreadable, shifting constantly through more familiar forms again to an almost incomprehensible slur. As over time researchers have recognized the stylistic pastiches and, as it were, returned the texts to their “origins”, the strangeness of the episode has been tamed to a degree, and the reading of the text, accompanied most commonly by paratextual explanations in modern editions, has become more regular and closed.

Among the Finnish and Swedish translations there is a difference in approaches towards this episode due to differences in the projects and horizons of the translations, and according to whether the translator emphasizes different recognizable stylistic pastiches or the entire arc of the episode as a compilation pastiche. First translators, Warburton and Saarikoski translate with a subdued stylistic flair, in a steadily progressive manner. Of the retranslators, Andersson does not mark the individual
pastiches explicitly, but does use greater variation of archaic lexicon, for instance, than the two preceding translators. Lehto stands out by explicitly noting the targets of the individual stylistic pastiches in paratexts, and with the greatest stylistic variation also in the translation proper.

As Bloom, for instance, joins Stephen Dedalus and the medical students in their revelry, there is a crack of thunder outside, which frightens Stephen. At that moment in the narration, Stephen turns from ‘Young Stephen’ to ‘young Boasthard’, and Mr Bloom from ‘Master Bloom’ to ‘Calmer’:

But was young Boasthard’s fear vanquished by Calmer’s words? No, for he had in his bosom a spike named Bitterness which could not by words be done away. And was he then neither calm like the one nor godly like the other? He was neither as much as he would have liked to be either. But could he not have endeavoured to have found again as in his youth the bottle Holiness that then he lived withal? Indeed no for Grace was not there to find that bottle. Heard he then in that clap the voice of the god Bringforth or, what Calmer said, a hubbub of Phenomenon?  

The style in which this passage is narrated, the hypotext looming under this hypertext, is John Bunyan’s Protestant allegory Pilgrim’s Progress of 1678. In my analysis of ‘Oxen’ and its translations, I have employed certain tag words and structures in the different stylistic pastiches that can be comparatively analysed in the source text and the Finnish and Swedish target texts. Pilgrim’s Progress can be identified as the hypotext of this passage by a few simple tags: Bunyan’s allegory makes use of personification whereby the hero, named simply “Christian” comes across characters called “Envy” or “Evangelist”. In the Oxen of the Sun hypertext (OSH) I have tagged Joyce’s use of capitalized personification in this passage and linked it to Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress.

The OSH will allow the reader of this thesis to browse the source text and target text examples of this chapter, in 30 sections, the back-translations of the target texts, and their respective hypotexts. On the site, the reader is able to compare the highlighted tags of lexical and syntactic traits, quotations, and allusions from source

171 See e.g. Gilbert 1955, 302-3.  
172 In the tradition of, for example, William Langland’s Piers Plowman (c. 1370–90).  
173 The Oxen of the Sun hypertext companion can be found at https://oxenofthesunhypertext.wordpress.com/. On the first visit, the site will require registration and approval from the domain supervisor.
text to translation, and from one translation to another. This experimental digital companion site allows for a more extensive analysis, with examples from all sections of the episode, and also more intensive analysis, as a non-Finnish or Swedish-speaking reader of the thesis will be able to compare the traces of intertextuality in translation, or lack thereof, for themselves. However, as pastiche is a complex and ambivalent practice, and cannot be reduced to certain lexical or syntactic traits, the digital companion cannot offer us quantitative comparative evidence of frequency and loyalty of pastiche in the source text and the target texts. Qualitative analysis is required, which I provide for the examples in the dissertation text proper, but which is left for the reader of the OSH in the digital companion.174

In the Bunyan section, further tags for a ‘neither–nor’ construction and the term ‘hubbub’ show more specifically that the text Joyce imitates here is the “Vanity Fair” episode of Bunyan’s work. The tagged term ‘Hubbub’ does not appear anywhere else in Pilgrim’s Progress, but it does appear three times in “Vanity Fair”. The ‘neither–nor’ construction is of course not unique to “Vanity Fair” or Pilgrim’s Progress, but it is common especially here: “he neither regardeth Prince nor People, Law nor Custom” (Bunyan 1907, 218).

174 Cf. Cheesman et al. (2017, 755-6) article “Multi-Retranslation Corpora: Visibility, Variation, Value, and Virtue”, in which variation in translation is researched through a corpus of forty German translations of Shakespeare on a web-based system exploring multiple translations and their variation. As an initial finding they report more questions than answers: “When does a translator’s use of language mimic a pre-existing style, when is it innovative, in what way? We can map texts to Wordnets, historical dictionaries and thesauri. We can model topics, analyse sentiments. We can explore consistency and coherence within translations, usage of less common words, word-classes, word-sets, grammatical, rhetorical, poetic, prosodic, metrical, metaphorical features, and so on. We can generate intertextual and phylogenetic trees. We can perhaps adjust Viv for historical sequence, and weight for the complex effects of influence, imitation, and intentional nonimitation.”
Synnyttäjä-jumalan äänen vai, kuten Tyynnättäjä sanoi, Ilmiön tyhjän hälinän?

1 Tyylli. John Bunyan (1628–1688), Kristityn vaellus (The Pilgrim’s Progress from This World to That Which Is to Come, 1678). Suom. vaikutteita Henrik Renquistin [sic] Viinan kauhistuksesta (1835).

2 Sikiönkehitys. Neljäs kuukausi alkaa.


WARBURTON


ANDERSSON


To any given reader of any of the translations it will be instantly noticeable that at this point in the episode the character names are replaced with capitalized personifications

175 PSO, 388: “But did the young Braggart’s fear vanish with Calmer’s words? No, for he had in his bosom a thorn called Bitterness, which could not be taken away by words. And was he not, then, calm like the other, and not godly like the other either? He was neither, as much as he would have wanted to be one of the two. But could he not have tried again to find, as in his youth, the bottle of Holiness, with which at that time he had lived? Certainly not, because there was no longer Mercy for him to find that bottle. Did he hear, then, in that clap of sounds the voice of Birth-giver god or, as Calmer said, the empty commotion of Phenomenon?”

176 LLU, 443: “But did Calmer’s words extinguish the fear of young Boast-and-Brag? No, for he had a thorn in bosom, called Embitterment, which words could not drive away. And was he not, then, any more calm as one and not devout as the other? He was neither as much as he wished to be this or that. But could he not have laboured to find again, as in his youth, the Holiness bottle along with which he at that time had lived? Surely not because there was no longer Mercy that he would have found that bottle. Did he hear, then, in that clap the voice of God Give-Birth or, as Calmer said, the humbug of Phenomenon?”

177 TWO, 378-9: “But could not Was-Comforting’s words chase young Large-Mouth’s fears away? No, because in his breast he bore the thorn of Bitterness, which no words could pluck out. And was he neither calm as the one or pious as the other? He was neither as much as he wanted to be either. But could he not have tried to rediscover the herb Godliness, that in his youth he possessed? No, for Grace was not in him to lead him to this herb. But heard he then in this thunderclap the voice of god Give-Birth or, as Was-Comforting said, only the alarm of Phenomenon?”

178 EAU, 388: “But was the young Show-off’s concern subdued by Gentle-withdrawal’s words? No, because in his heart he had a thorn named Bitterness which no words could withdraw. And was he then neither gentle like the one or godly like the other? He was neither, although he would have liked to be either. But could he not have taken the trouble to retrieve as in his youth the bottle Holiness, without which he had since lived? Not, for Grace was not consenting to come about the bottle. Did he not hear in the bang the voice of god Birth-giver but, as Gentle-withdrawal said, the noise of a Phenomenon?”
of their character traits. It may also be recognizable, within the Western Christian cultural circle, that the style is that of classical allegory. However, the specific style of John Bunyan is not likely to be recognizable without a textual companion or a paratextual explanation. In the OSH, I have made the corresponding tags to the target texts as to the source text, and compared them with relevant possible Bunyan hypotexts (that is to say common editions of Finnish and Swedish Pilgrim’s Progress translations from an appropriate period).

In G. S. Löwenhielm’s translation in a Kristens resa edition of 1912, edited by B. Aurelius, Bunyan’s capitalized personifications are conveyed, and the ‘neither-nor’ construction is translated as ‘varken-eller’. Both of these tags are imitated, as is to be expected, by Warburton and Andersson. However, we can see that the pastiches of the Swedish translations are not tied to the lexical tags of hubbub/uppror: Warburton translates ‘hubbub’ as ‘larmet’, Andersson as ‘oväsendet’. What is instantly noticeable is the economy of Warburton’s translation, and some differences in interpretation: ‘herb’ for ‘bottle’ in Warburton, for instance.

In the Finnish Kristityn vaellus of 1933, translated by Erkki Kaila, the capitalized personification is again observed, and the ‘neither-nor’ construction is translated as a repeated ‘ei-eikä’ construction. The Finnish translators of Ulysses, Saarikoski and Lehto, do not repeat this, although both use a near-repetition of ‘eikö, eikä’. For hubbub/kiihtymys, neither of the translations convey the tag: Saarikoski translates ‘hälinän’ and Lehto a nonethnocentric, source text-oriented formulation ‘humbugin’.

What is perhaps not instantly obvious to a reader of my back-translations, but certainly to a Finnish-speaking reader, is that Lehto, the Finnish retranslator, does something more than merely imitate the original imitation here. Instead of – or rather in addition to – imitating, or giving the impression of imitating Bunyan, he imitates syntactically and orthographically another writer, a writer from the history of Finnish prose, namely Henrik Renqvist (1789 – 1866) and his Viinan kauhistus – ‘The Horrors of Alcohol’ (1835). Lehto constructs the entire episode 14 of Ulysses in this fashion, “doing what Joyce did”:179 He substitutes the embryonic development of English prose with the embryonic development of Finnish prose style. However, as we

---

see here, it is not a simple question of substituting Bunyan with Renqvist, but rather Lehto adds to the semantic and stylistic pastiche of Bunyan the syntactic and orthographic features of Renqvist. The Bunyan pastiche is still visible under the imitation of Renqvist. In the ‘Oxen of the Sun’ hypertext I have added tags for the Renqvist pastiche of Lehto’s translation, and an example of this secondary hypotext.

One might ask, if so few of the formal and lexical tags that would seem to convey the Bunyan pastiche in English are conveyed in translation, what is the effect of the translated pastiches? In the first translations it is clear in both Warburton and Saarikoski that the text is archaic, and the formulations and the content give clues to the genre of Christian allegory. In the retranslations it may be expected that their target readers will be aware, through research literature and annotated editions, that this is “an episode of pastiches” – in fact it may be hard to imagine a reader coming to the 14th episode of Ulysses and be able to read it as anything but “that impossible episode with all the pastiches”. Lehto explicates this structure for his target readers by creating an archaistic re-creation of “what Joyce did” in the much shorter history of Finnish prose styles, in addition to which he explicates both the original hypotexts and his own sources in the footnotes.

A (re)translator is rereading and rewriting the source text using hermeneutic judgement to modulate the information, style, and effect of the source text in the target text horizon. How the text is modulated, the choices the translator makes, are governed by the translation project. In this episode, the Finnish and Swedish translators may be seen to shift from their general translation projects to different degrees. Warburton’s translation is invisible and somewhat assimilative, and Saarikoski might be considered less playful here than in ‘Cyclops’. Andersson’s ‘Oxen’ is perhaps most consistent with his project of a “Swedish Joyce”, but Leevi Lehto’s ‘Oxen’ is dramatically different from the manifest and nonethnocentric project of the other episodes of his translation. Here, Lehto creates an archaic “Finnish Joyce” of impossible hypotexts, as Finnish prose was scarce and un-developed up until the 19th century.

---

180 Caetano Waldrigues Galindo, the translator of the third and the latest Brazilian Ulysses, has described a similar strategy of replacing Portuguese-Brazilian equivalents for the authors, styles, genres and periods that Joyce had emulated in his translation of ‘Oxen’: “I had to translate the original trying to create pastiches of true historical Portuguese texts, from the trovadores of the 13th century, through Camões and Brazilian Romanticism, to end with a collage of all types of jargons” (Galindo 2020, 218).

181 The tags on the hypertext are for <x> instead of “ks”, for an archaic ending vowel, a voiced oral occlusive instead of a voiceless one, and an archaic inflection unique to Renqvist’s style.
century. Even though Lehto’s ‘Oxen’ is ethnocentric or, in Venuti’s terms, domesticating, it is certainly not invisible to a Finnish reader, and it actively challenges the translation pact, as it constantly reminds the readers that they are reading a translation, not the original, by its use of explicated “double pastiches”.

In his Finnish retranslation of ‘Oxen’, Lehto has created a new translation strategy for Joyce’s intertextual construction. Antoine Berman (2009, 220) assumes a critical stance toward “archaizing” and “formal” translation projects of John Donne’s poetry into French, which, according to him, attempt to create a “French Donne” which did not, and could not, exist, and which diminishes the specific strangeness and English otherness of “a Donne in French” (cf. Berman 2009, 98). Lehto’s ‘Oxen’, domesticated in the Finnish literary terroir, certainly adds complexity and, perhaps, confusion to his translation project for his reader, but, on the other hand, it is true to his translating position of “doing what Joyce did”.

I have argued above, in chapter 2, that the existence, within a single language or in different languages, of translations with different projects, with different purposes and horizons, will form a polyphonic hubbub, which, in Patrick O’Neill’s terms, forms an ever-evolving polyglot macrotext, which constantly rewrites the original source text. If we look at this polyphonic interaction in ‘Oxen’, it would preliminarily appear that Erik Andersson’s retranslation attempts to go both creatively further towards the Swedish language and aesthetic horizon, and philologically further toward the native strangeness of Joyce’s episode of pastiches in greater hermeneutic and interpretative accuracy. As for the Finnish Ulysses macrotext, Pentti Saarikoski’s translation re-creates in a more recognizable form the evolving compilation pastiche of the ‘Oxen’, whereas Lehto adds information on the specific stylistic pastiches and the intertextual method used in the episode by Joyce.

In the following sub-chapter, I will offer a more detailed analysis, with examples from the hypertext, of the polyphonic interaction of these translations and their different translation strategies.

5.2. Translating pastiche

According to Mark Osteen, Joyce manages an ‘intertextual economy’ in the ‘Oxen’. Osteen argues that the episode “first confronts the inescapable fact of literary
debtorship and then demonstrates how Joyce both acknowledges the debts to his predecessors and makes literary capital from them” (Osteen 2004, 125). The translators of the episode can also be seen to be working on this economy of borrowing, stealing and re-paying. Osteen goes on to discern two readings of ‘Oxen’: one is a reading of Derridean iterability, where the episode “deconstructs the difference between borrowing and originality by making the latter a function of the citationality of the text” (Osteen 2004, 127). The other reading is that of Riffaterre’s ‘legitimate’ intertextuality: “Joyce wants his readers to recognise his specific intertextual sources [...] and invites us to try to recover the historical conditions of the discourses he imitates” (ibid.). Joyce’s “anthology” of pastiches does not explicitly name its models, but it fulfils the pastiche contract by more covert textual markers: the individual stylistic imitations can and have been linked to the ‘originals’ by slightly scratching the surface text. However, the ‘originality’ of the episode seems to lie in the collage of the individual imitations, the compilation pastiche. In Kristevian terms, the status of the episode is still defined more horizontally than vertically.

In his 2001 book Experiences in Translation Umberto Eco discusses translating intertextual text material, especially the translations of his own intertextual novels.182 Eco also adopts a pragmatic approach, wherein he advocates that the translator analyses the intended effect “programmed” into the source text (Eco 2001, 45). Eco’s pragmatism resembles the dynamic translation of Eugene A. Nida, as he demands that the translation reproduces the intended effect of the source text in the target language and culture: “Instead of speaking of equivalence of meaning, we can speak of functional equivalence: a good translation must generate the same effect aimed at by the original” (Eco 2001, 44-5). Although I agree that the nature of translatorial action requires the translator to interpret the effect and “hypothesize” about the intention of the source text, the text may be re-created in its own horizon with different effects, according to the project. This may indeed be preferable for the work to “go beyond itself” in new languages and cultures.

182 In the translations of his own text containing intertextual allusions, in this case the novel Foucault’s Pendulum (Il pendolo di Foucault), Eco favours changes to lexical meaning and intertextual reference to preserve the “psychological sense” of the text: “Thus, to preserve the psychological sense of the text (and to render it understandable within the framework of the receiving cultures), translators were entitled not only to make radical changes to the literal meaning of the original text, but also to its reference – since, in Italian, Diotallevi is said to have seen a hedge, while in other languages this is not the case” (Eco 2001, 16).
What truly makes ‘Oxen’ a special case in the light of translation is not the relationship of the author and his influences, the fact that an author is always first a reader, but the fact that the original text of ‘Oxen’ explicitly relinquishes some of its authorial ownership to the act of reading, and suggests that readers are co-creators. Therefore translators – the interpreters but also co-creators of the text – may be allowed to feel a special degree of freedom or power over their target-texts in this episode. In Mark Osteen’s terms, the episode is a “redefinition and redistribution of authorship” (Osteen 2004, 129).

Joyce commented to Harriet Shaw Weaver that the episode comprised “nine circles of development (enclosed within the headpiece and tailpiece of opposite chaos)” (LIII, 16). Literary scholar Robert Janusko (1983, 47-52) has argued in his The Sources and Structures of James Joyce’s “Oxen” that Joyce worked on nine notebooks, each one representing, in accordance to his technic of embryonic development, one month of gestation. Through genetic analysis of Joyce’s sources, Janusko separates different imitations, which he calls parodies, and correlates them in a “Working outline” (Janusko 1983, 79-82) to narrative events and the development of the human embryo.\footnote{Janusko finds both intratextual and paratextual evidence of the process of collation he argues Joyce used: “For the most part, however, Joyce did use his borrowed vocabulary in the proper parodies, or at least in the proper periods, so that the various styles can be identified” (Janusko 1983, 58).} The beginning of the episode, the headpiece, takes place before the conception of English prose style, and therefore before specifically identifiable stylistic imitation. The stylistic pastiches proper begin, as Joyce indicates in a letter to Budgen 13 March 1920, from the “earliest English alliterative and monosyllabic and Anglo Saxon” (LI, 139), Ælfric of Eynsham, and the alliterative poem The Wanderer. The tailpiece or the “afterbirth” is a miscellany of, not written prose, but forms of spoken language.

In my analysis I follow Janusko’s chronology of nine months of gestation and 28 main pastiche sequences, added to which are the headpiece and tailpiece, and compare his presentation with other commentators, mainly Gilbert (1955), Gifford & Seidman(1988), and Johnson (1998). For convenience of presentation, I will divide my analysis to the subsections of ‘headpiece’, ‘first trimester’, ‘second trimester’, ‘third trimester’, and ‘tailpiece.’
5.2.1 Headpiece

‘Oxen of the Sun’ begins with a thrice repeated sentence, in which the first word is in Irish, the second is an English proper noun denoting the street on which we pick up the wandering Mr Bloom, and the third is a Latin verb. According to Gilbert (1955, 296) it is a “set of three incantations, in the manner of Fratres Arvales, each thrice repeated”:

Send us bright one, light one, Horhorn, quickening and wombfruit.

All the four translators leave the Irish, English, and Latin of the first three words untranslated, even though the first translators’, Warburton’s and Saarikoski’s, readers have little hope of understanding the sentence. The retranslators, Lehto and Andersson, are no more explanatory in the translation proper, but they add philological information by offering translations for the terms in paratexts: Lehto in his footnotes, Andersson in the glossary of foreign terms at the end of the book. However, the translations of ‘Horhorn’, which is clearly a pun on the last name of the master of the hospital, Dr. Andrew J. Horne, but also the “horn of plenty” or even of “having a horn”, are interesting:

SAARIKOSKI
Anna meille, sinä valoisa, sinä valkoinen, Hornhorn, uusi elämä ja kohdunheelmä.

LEHTO
Lähettäös meillen uxi, uxi kirkas, Sarsarwi, potkiwainen ja kohdunheelmä.

WARBURTON
Giv oss, Klara, Stjärna, Gullhorn, kvick frisk livsfrukt.

Backtranslation: “Give us, you bright, you white, Hornhorn, new life and the fruit of the womb.”

Backtranslation: “Send ye upon us one, one bright, Horhorn, kicking and fruit of the womb.”

Backtranslation: “Give us, Bright, Star, Goldhorned, swift healthy fruit of womb.”
ANDERSSON
Giv oss o klara, o ljusa, Hornhorn, hälsa kraft och livsfrukt.

Backtranslation: “Give us clear one, light one, Hornhorn, health strength and fruit of womb.”

Saarikoski and Andersson translate ‘Horn’ as a proper noun, or rather do not translate, with “Hornhorn” (still curiously not the ‘Horhorn’ of the source text either). Lehto translates the Finnish for “horn”, ‘sarvi’, adding the lost reference to the character in a footnote. Thomas Warburton finds a way to allude to ‘Gullhorna’ (or ‘Gallehus-horna’), the 5th-century Danish Golden Horns of Gallehus, used presumably (and appropriately for incantation) for blowing or drinking, and by extension possibly also to a poem Guldhornene (1802) by Danish poet Adam Gottlob Oehlenschläger, credited for introducing romanticism into Danish literature.

Already at this point of his ‘Oxen’ translation, Lehto uses the syntax and orthography of early Finnish Bible translations. If we consider the view of Janusko, and Joyce in his letter to Budgen,“ this is the headpiece of the episode, before the conception of English prose style and before the start of the stylistic imitations. That Lehto begins here (albeit implicitly) his Finnish pastiches seems surprising, and the imitation of translated Finnish reformation prose might be considered unmotivated.

The next passage, which Joyce named in his letter to Budgen as written in the style of Roman historians Sallust and Tacitus, is especially interesting from a translation point of view because, as Gilbert (1955, 298) points out, it is rendered as if it were a word-for-word translation from Latin: “This appalling sentence reads like the literal translation of a tract on child welfare written in mediæval Latin [...] by a demented German Docent.” To a modern reader the source text reads as a poor machine translation:

Universally that person’s acumen is esteemed very little perceptive concerning whatsoever matters are being held as most profitably by mortals with sapience endowed[...]

JJU, 314

184 “Technique: a nineparted episode without divisions introduced by a Sallustian-Tacitean prelude” (LI, 139).
Here we have a pastiche of a poor word-for-word translation. How is this to be translated forward in time and into another language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yleisesti arvioidaan sellaisen henkilön äly kaikkea muuta kuin teräväksi joka olipa kysymys mistä tahansa sellaisesta asiasta jota viisaudella siunatut kuolevaiset [...]</td>
<td>Universaalisesti sen ihmisen ymmärrys on arvosteltu ylen vähän huomaavaiseksi koskein kaikenkallaisia seikkoja kuolevaisten taidollisella taidolla siunattujen [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I allmähett uppskattas den persons skarpsinne såsom i mycket ringa grad genomträngande rörande vilka åsikter som än hysas såsom de fördelaktigaste av de dödliga som begåvats med visdom [...]</td>
<td>Allmänt bedöms den människas skarpsinne vara mycket dåligt ägnat beträffande allt som betraktas som mest gagneligt av dödliga med vishet utrustade [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first translators, Saarikoski and Warburton, seem to be turning a pastiche of a bad translation into something syntactically more acceptable, dangerously close to what would simply appear as a “bad translation”. They turn the explicitly strange and foreign pastiche of a word-for-word translation into a more recognizable and acceptable target language text, which is in danger of losing the explicit feel of translated prose. Retranslators Lehto and Andersson make their translations “poorer”, or more strange, which in this case is more equivalent to the source text. Lehto again highlights the archaic nature of the text by historical orthography.

---

185 PSO, 376: “Generally is estimated the sort of person’s intellect far from sharp who whether it is a question of any such matter which mortals with wisdom endowed[...].”

186 LLU, 429: “Universally that human’s understanding has been valued very little perceptive concerning all sorts of issues with mortals’ wise skill blessed[...].”

187 TWO, 367: “In general, that person’s acumen is estimated as very slightly penetrating concerning which ever opinions are held as most advantageous by the mortals endowed with wisdom[...].”

188 EAU, 377: “Generally is assessed that man’s ingenuity to be very poor with regard to everything that is considered most beneficial by mortals wisely equipped[...].”
In the following passage, with the thudding oxen hoofs of Ælfric’s alliterative rhythmic prose, especially his *Homilies* (Johnson 1998, 908), the history of English prose is conceived, and the stylistic pastiches proper begin.

5.2.2. First trimester

According to Joyce and Gilbert, the “first circle of development” begins as the “spermatozoon” Bloom enters the hospital. In Janusko’s (1983, 79) analysis, the first month of gestation begins with Bloom’s entrance and the first identifiable imitation, that of Ælfric’s (c. 955-c.1020) prose. This passage is more than a general style of (originally an oral tradition of) Old English, it is a recognizable pastiche of Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*. In any case the shift from the style of the medieval Latin prose chronicles is clear. The following passage highlights the monosyllabic and alliterative nature of Anglo-Saxon prose:

> Before born bliss babe had. Within womb won he worship. Whatever in that one case done commodiously done was. A couch by midwives attended with wholesome food reposeful, cleanest swaddles as though forthbringing were now done and by wise foresight set: but to this no less of what drugs there is need and surgical implements which are pertaining to her case not omitting aspect of all very distracting spectacles in various latitudes by our terrestrial orb offered together with images, divine and human, the cogitation of which by sejunct females is to tumescence conducive or eases issue in the high sunbright wellbuilt fair home of mothers when, ostensibly far gone and reproductitive, it is come by her thereto to lie in, her term up.

*JHU*, 315

The “monosyllabic tramp of lumpish assonance like the thudding hoofs of oxen” (Gilbert 1955, 298) conveys the image of Old English prose. Another hypotext often mentioned for this passage is the Old English “Wanderer” poems, but Janusko identifies Ælfric as the source of the entire section 315.60–316.106 of Bloom entering the hall. The concrete hypotext he references, an excerpt from Ælfric’s *St. Cuthbert*, as quoted in George Saintsbury’s *A History of English Prose Rhythm*, has, however, on closer analysis more textual relevance to the section beginning “Some man that

---

189 On Ælfric’s style: “He is a graceful writer, intelligent, clear and unpedantic, a winning expositor of the culture of the Church, the mother of arts and letters throughout this period. His homilies are called ‘catholic’ not for their orthodoxy but because they were designed to be read by all, lay as well as cleric” (Alexander 2000, 32).
wayfaring was” (JHU, 315.71). In fact, Saintsbury (1912, 34) comments that the four Ælfric text excerpts he offers show “little or no alliteration, and what there is [...] is not of a rhythmical character at all”, but, commenting on the Cuthbert passage he notes that here “[l]he alliteration is laid on with a butter-knife” (Saintsbury 1912, 35).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jo ennen syntymäänsä oli auvollinen lapsi.</td>
<td>Potrat² on poiaat pyhäiset net piltit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohdussa palvontaa osaksensa sai. Kaikki mikä</td>
<td>Kohdussa kovin ja korkeast ol kunniotetut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tässä erityisessä tilanteessa helpotuksaksi oli,</td>
<td>Helpotus, huolenpito heille, hoiva hellin!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se tehtin. Seimen turvaiseen olivat kätilöt, ikään</td>
<td>Seimensä äärell kätilöiset kelvot kunnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuin synnytys jo olisi tapahtunut, varustaneet</td>
<td>kestityksen toit, kapaloisiin käärät kunni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terveellisin ruoan, mitä puhtaimmin kapaloin,</td>
<td>päästöö jo päättymällään olis viisain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visiisalla kaukonäköisyydellä kaiken asettaneet:</td>
<td>varokeinoin: lisäksi tullen vielä lääkkeet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutta tämän lisäksi vielä tarvittavat lääkeaineet</td>
<td>tarpeen mukaan sekä haaraukeinot henen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sekä kirurgiset välineet, jotka saattoivat tulla</td>
<td>kohdall tähelliset kuvat muistustoa myös</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kysymykseen hänen tapauksessaan, unohtamatta</td>
<td>monenmoisien maanpiirin eri leveysasteilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erilaisia hupaisia näkymiä tämän maapallon</td>
<td>katsottaviks kera vielä tauluin, jumaloi kuin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miehiä taiäkkäin kuin synnytys jo olisi tapahtunut</td>
<td>ihmisiiän esiin-tuovain, joidenka tutkistelu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sekä jumalaa että ihmisiä esittävän kanssa, joiden</td>
<td>poloin naisenpuolten toimest paisuntaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katsominen lapsivuoteessa naisilla edistää paisua</td>
<td>matkaansaattava tai päätöö hilperttava on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja helpottaa päästöö tässä korkeassa aurinkoissa hyvin</td>
<td>talossa tuossa taidokkaassa, ylväässä,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rakennetussa kaunissa talossa, kun hänen</td>
<td>valoisassa äitein suvalo, kun pitkälle tilan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hetkenä on koitottun, tullut aika hänen saapua</td>
<td>kehitteenä nähtiin jo, saapuminen on ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinne makaamaan, silmännähdän pitkälle</td>
<td>aloillaan makaaminen, kuni hetkens’ koittaa.¹⁹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ehtineenä ja synnykseen valmiina.¹⁹⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁹⁰ PSO, 377: “Even before birth, the child had happiness. In womb received he worship. All that in this particular situation was of relief, was done. A secure manger had the midwives, as if the birth had already taken place, supplied with the healthiest foods, most clean swaddling clothes, had all by wise foresight set: but also the necessary medicines and surgical instruments which are pertaining to her case, not forgetting various entertaining spectacles in different latitudes of our planet, which had been put in view along with images, both gods and people, the viewing of which for women in their child beds increases the swell and eases the issue in this high, sunny, wellbuilt beautiful house, when her time has come, the time has come for her to lie down there, ostensibly far gone and reproductive.”

¹⁹¹ LLU, 431: “Boys are sturdy, those holy laddies! In utero very and highly respected they were. Relief, nurture for them, most gentle care. At the manger those goodly midwives brought a proper feast, wrapped in swaddling clothes, as if the forthing brought was already about to end with wise foresight set: besides this, the medicines needed as well as the surgical implements important to her case, remembering also the various images from different latitudes of the world to view with furthermore pictures, depicting both gods and people, the cogitation of which for the poor women is for tumescence conductive or eases the release in that house skilful, grand, bright where mothers, when they were seen to have far advanced, were to enter and to lie still until their time came.”
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In his translation, Lehto designates the contested “Before born bliss babe had” section to Ælfric, and the “Some man that wayfaring was” passage to The Wanderer in his footnotes, and translates highlighting the alliterative nature at the expense of dictionary correspondences. However, as the tagged lexical and syntactic traits and archaic formulations in the Oxen of the Sun hypertext indicate, Ælfric seems to be the target of the pastiche in the part Lehto assigns to The Wanderer. St. Cuthbert goes at night to the sea to sing his beads, as the “wayfaring” man in the “Oxen” comes to the housedoor “at night’s oncoming” (JJU, 315.71-2) after having “over land and seafloor nine years […] long outwandered” (JJU, 316.87-8).

The Swedish translators tread a middle ground on alliteration, and find flowing, idiomatic monosyllabic expressions also clearly helped by Swedish, which has a more ample supply of monosyllabic expressions. Saarikoski stands out by seemingly ignoring any attempt at alliteration, and by simplifying the style and syntax in an ethnocentric manner.

If we acknowledge pastiche in the stylistic imitation sense as a recognizable imitation of a specific author, acknowledging both the identity of the pasticheur and

---

192 TWO, 368: “Tranquillity received the foetus before birth. In belly abode was he adored. All that could be done was carefully done. A lair was prepared by midwives with a healthy diet rest and clean swaddling clothes as if the birth was already done and by all wisdom set: but besides this, the drugs needed and instruments suited for each case not forgetting the aspect of a variety of distracting imagery from all corners of the earth of gods and men whose perception and cogitation in women in their child beds facilitate the development of the fruit of the womb or bring relief in the high wellbuilt bright mothers’ home where she, when her time has come, lies in.”

193 EAU, 378: “Before birth blessed was the foetus. In the woman’s womb was his praise sung. Whatever in this case made comfortable was done. A bed by midwives attended with fit food peaceful, cleanest swaddling clothes as the forthbringing was now done and by wise foresight set: but no shortage of what drugs there is need and surgical instruments pertaining to her case not forgetting the aspect of large relaxing spectacles from different latitudes of our terrestrial globe, together with images, celestial and human, the cogitation of which in sejunct women is for tumescence conducive or facilitates the release in the high sunbright wellbuilt beautiful home of mothers when they, ostensibly far gone and reproductive, have entered, waiting for their time.”

---
the author being imitated, we must consider what relevance the specific allocation of the hypotext has for Joyce’s compilation pastiche, a tapestry of stylistic imitations, and how that relates to the translations. Lehto’s Finnish retranslation project places an explicit demand on itself to both recognize and explicate, in paratext and in a discernibly changing style, each individual stylistic pastiche, and therefore it becomes problematic when the designation of the hypotext is not supported by analysis. The other three translations operate, and succeed or fail, rather on the collage, montage, compilation level of pastiche.

In the text of ‘Oxen’, the stylistic pastiches are not named as, for instance, in another modernist pastiche cycle, *L’affaire Lemoine* (1904; 1908) by Marcel Proust. Mostly, however, they are to be identified, as the paratextual evidence of Joyce’s letters and later analysis demonstrates, by certain textual markers. Gérard Genette would call this the *pastiche contract*. The pastiche contract consists of textual markers in the hypertext, first stating the status of the text as an imitative one, and secondly offering textual clues between pastiche and the imitated text. Genette is interested in the practical means by which a pastiche is communicated. In Genette’s famous formulation this due warning of the pastiche writer to his audience “could be spelled out by the compact formula *this is a text where x imitates y*” (Genette 1997, 86). The textual markers announcing the pastiche will make it possible for the reader to appreciate and evaluate the imitation and, for Genette, this separates pastiche from the literary fake. What are these markers in ‘Oxen’ and how can they be conveyed in the translations?

As Nyqvist (2010, 207) elaborates, the *pastiche contract* is not a contract between the pasticheur and the author being imitated, but between the imitator and the reader: “It is an invitation to read the text as if it were written by the author being imitated, but also simultaneously a request to look for those essential differences that legitimise the imitation as pastiche.” In the absence of titles and other paratextual evidence fulfilling the function of the pastiche contract, there are a number of ways in which a pastiche can communicate its hypotext. In the case of ‘Oxen’ the simple fact of the evolving and ever-changing style, from a more archaic orthography and syntax

---

194 It bears restating here, that Genette’s (1997, 85) understanding of pastiche “an imitation in playful mode whose primary function is pure entertainment” does not fully correspond with my definition of pastiche, which can have different functions including, very often, a critical attitude, and does not quite fit the treatment of Joyce’s ‘Oxen’ as pastiche(s).
towards a more modern style and ultimately slang will alert the reader to attempt to assign the styles in their temporal and cultural context. Critics and writers disagree as to whether quotation is an approved technique in pastiche. For Genette (1997, 78), “the pastiche, whose function is to imitate the letter, prides itself upon paying it the least possible literal allegiance. It can never condescend to direct quotations or borrowings.” However, Joyce certainly makes use of allusion and quotation in his pastiches.

In the passage concerning Bloom’s and nurse Callan’s conversation about Mrs Purefoy’s delivery, Joyce not only imitates the style of the late medieval morality play Everyman, but also covertly alludes to the title of the play in the beginning of the passage, and nearly quotes the Messenger’s prologue in the beginning of the play “Look well, and take good heed to the ending[...]”.

Therefore, everyman, look to that last end that is thy death and the dust that gripeth on every man that is born of woman for as he came naked forth from his mother’s womb so naked shall he wend him at the last for to go as he came.

JU, 316

A version of this hypotext exists both in Swedish and in Finnish, namely translations of Jedermann (1911) by the Austrian playwright Hugo von Hofmannsthal: in Swedish Emil Hillberg’s “authorized translation” by the name Einvar (1916), and in Finnish Jokamies by Huugo Jalkanen (1916).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen vuoksi, jokainen, katso tuota viimeistä hetkeä, joka on sinun kuolemasi, ja tomua, joka imehnon jok’ainoan omaksensa ottaa, joka naisesta syntynyt on, sillä niin kuin hän alastomana tuli äitinsä kohdusta, niin pitää hänen alastomana lopulta pois lähtemän, jotta hän sen tien menisi kuin tullutkin on.</td>
<td>Senteuchen¹, iokamies, katzo sihen vimme hetken ioca on sinun cuolemas, ia tomun ioca iokaisen ioka waimosta syndynyt² on ylesotta, sille ette quin hän Alastoina eitens Cochdust tulip niin pite hjenen Alastoina lehtemen menexen niin kuni tullutki on.³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


² PSO, 378: “Therefore, every one, look at that last moment that is your death, and the dust that grasps each man who is born of a woman, for as he came naked from the womb of his mother, so shall he in the end leave hence naked, for to go the way he came.”

³ LLU, 432: “Therefore, everyman, look to that last moment that is your death, and the dust that gripeth every one that is born of a wife, for as he came naked from the womb of his mother, so shall he go naked for to go the way he came.”
vastineensa myös suomenkielisen kirjallisuuden historiassa, joten tyylipastisseista tulee samalla kahden perinteen ristisiitoksia. Alkupuolella
suom. vastineet ovat pakosta jonkin verran nuorempia; liioin ei ole välittämättä pyiritty vastaavuuteen kirjailijoiden tai tekstien temperamentissä tai tyylissä niin kuin Joycenkins valinnat ovat usein anakronistisia eivätkä aina “aiheenmukaisesti” motivoituja.

2 “Ihminen, vaimosta syntynyt, elää vähän aikaa ja on täynnä levottomuutta.” (Job 14:1.)
3 “Ja hän sanoi: ‘Alastonna minä tulin äitini kohdusta, ja alastonna mina sinne palajan” (Job 1:21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Därföre, Envar, begrunda denna din ändalykt som är din död och stoftet som skall mottaga envar av kvinna född ty naken som han kom utur sin moders liv skall han en gång vända åter och varda stoft.</td>
<td>Därföre, envar, betänk det sista slut som är din död och det stoft som griper efter varje människa av kvinna född ty naken kom han ur sin moders liv och lika naken skall han vända åter till sist och gå liksom han kom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morality plays of the 15th and 16th centuries, played by travelling companies showed the lives of representative humans encountering personified characters such as Knowledge or Good Deeds. The soliloquizing, exclamatory, and dramatic style is conveyed by the translations, as well as the final moral of the content. In the OSH, I have made a tag for the allusion to the title of the play, “Everyman”, the partial quotation mentioned above, and the archaic verb ending ‘gripeth’. Retranslators Lehto and Andersson render the covert allusion to the title of the play in their translations. Warburton seems to emphasize the fact by capitalizing ‘Envar’ whereas Saarikoski does not re-create the connection, first translating ‘jokainen’ in the beginning of the passage and ‘imehnon jok’ainoan’ later for ‘every man’.

Warburton, Saarikoski, and Andersson re-create in their horizon a sense of oratory, or sermon, and opt for some archaic lexicon: Warburton has “ändalykt” instead of “slut” for ‘end’ and Saarikoski “imehnon” instead of “ihminen” for ‘man’, for instance. In Lehto’s translation, at this point, begin the explicit pastiches from the

---

197 TWO, 370: “Therefore, Everyman, consider this your last end that is your death and the dust that shall grasp everyman born of a woman for naked as he came out of his mother’s womb, so shall he once again return and turn to dust again.”
198 EAU, 380: “Therefore, everyman, remember the last end that is your death, and the dust that gripeth on every man of a woman born, for naked he came out of his mother’s womb, and likewise naked he will return at the end and go as he came.”
199 In Finnish, ‘imehno’, ‘imehmo’, and ‘ihmeno’ are archaic and dialectical variants for the now regular ‘ihminen’.

150
history of Finnish prose, with the imitation of the orthography and syntax of the father of written Finnish language and the first Finnish Bible translator, Mikael Agricola (c. 1510–1557). This pastiche calls for quite an intensive knowledge of the target reader. Partly due to the changes in language (for instance graphemes indicating voiceless dental non-sibilant fricatives, no longer in use in modern Finnish) and partly due to the availability of the sorts of letter type in the Swedish printing presses of Agricola’s time, the written Finnish has changed to the extent that the reader of Lehto’s very pedantic pastiche would have to be able to read “äitinsä kohdusta” (‘his mother’s womb’) in the graphemes “eitens Cochdust”.

5.2.3. Second trimester

The first trimester concludes with pastiches of The Travels of Sir John Mandeville and Sir Thomas Malory, which are treated in the OSH. On closer inspection the section after the Mandeville pastiche, designated in Joyce’s letter to Budgen as being written in the style of Malory’s Morte d’Arthur, comprises borrowings and elements from at least, in addition to Malory, Sir Thomas More, Sir Thomas Elyot, and especially John Bourchier, Lord Berners. Likewise, the following passage, which Joyce called the Elizabethan chronicle style, is a compilation of the quotations, syntactic traits and lexical traits of John Wycliffe, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Raphael Holinshed. In these passages the collage, montage or compilation nature of the ‘Oxen’ pastiches becomes evident.

Although in the works of Fredric Jameson, Hal Foster, and in the Anglo-American postmodern discourse in general the medley sense of compilation pastiche has become a political and negatively charged term, a symptom of the postmodernist disease of late capitalism, a compilation sense of pastiche would seem applicable to Joyce’s method in ‘Oxen’. In the Malory passage, the Elizabethan chronicle passage, and the following Latinate style passage (a compilation of Milton, Taylor, and Browne), it becomes next to impossible to discern the overriding pastiche forest for

200 Janusko suggests Joyce has later forgotten or confused a turn of phrase he has copied in his notebook: “It is, in fact, Lord Berners who seems to be a primary source from ‘Now let us speak of that fellowship’ (U, 388,17), a typical Berners introduction, to the end of the section designated by Joyce as a Malory parody, including the passage in which appear the lines cited by Joyce in his letter as a sample of Malory” (Janusko 1983, 62).
201 See e.g. Foster 1985, 121–37.
Nyqvist (2010, 137), sees the recent usage of the compilation sense of pastiche as a problematic one due to its use as a theoretical keyword on the one hand and a practical concept on the other. Referring to Claude Lévi-Strauss’ *The Savage Mind* she comments: “In the descriptions of compilation pastiche in recent criticism, the pasticheur appears as a kind of bricoleur, a collector and compiler of materials provided by culture, from which he or she then produces a new creation.” Without any negative charge, this would seem an apt description of Joyce’s Milton, Taylor, Browne pastiche, for instance:

> Remember, Erin, thy generations and thy days of old, how thou settedst little by me and by my word and broughtest in a stranger to my gates to commit fornication in my sight and to wax fat and kick like Jeshurum. Therefore hast thou sinned against my light and hast made me, thy lord, to be the slave of servants.

*JJU*, 322

Let us compare this with an excerpt a little later on in the passage, ostensibly from the same Milton, Taylor, Browne pastiche:

> A black crack of noise in the street here, alack, bawled back. Loud on left Thor thundered: in anger awful the hammerhurler. Came now the storm that hist his heart. And Master Lynch bade him have a care to flout and witwanton as the god self was angered for his hellprate and paganry.

*JJU*, 323

In the OSH, I have marked the syntactic traits of Jeremy Taylor (1613–1667) and his *On Prayer*, the lexical and syntactic traits of John Milton (1608–1674) and his *Areopagitica*, and Sir Thomas Browne’s (1605–1682) characteristic, rhythmical use of both archaic and modern present tense third-person singular forms of verbs. Gilbert (1952, 294) mentions the *Improperia* (Reproaches) of the Catholic liturgy, but the Authorized Version, the King James Bible and especially The Fifth Book of Moses is an obvious hypotext which Janusko, for instance, does not even cite. There are no translations of Taylor into Swedish or Finnish, but Browne’s *Religio medici* has been translated into Finnish as *Lääkärin uskonto* in 1921. Milton’s *Areopagitica* has not been translated into Swedish or Finnish, but Milton’s style exists in both languages, of

---

Saintsbury (1912, 198) notes that this variation allows rhythmical dexterity in Browne’s prose: “if both verbs in the first clause had had the -s, or both the –th, the rhythm would have been not a little inquinated, as Browne himself might have said.”
course, in *Paradise Lost* (Det Förlorande Paradiset and Kadotettu Paratiisi, respectively). I have linked that as a hypotext in the OSH, and tagged a lexical trait and a syntactic trait that *Aeropagitica* and *Paradise Lost* share, which can then be compared to the *Paradise Lost* translations. I have also tagged the Bible allusions to their translations in both languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muista, Erin, menneet sukupolvesta ja ammioiset päivästä, kun sinä pienennä istuit minun jalkiani ja minun sanaini juureissa ja toit muukalaisen minun porteilleni huorin tekemään minun silmäni nähden, lihavaksi paisumaan ja ilakoinaan kuin Jeshurun. Sen tähden olet sinä tehnyt syntyä valoav vastaan ja olet satanut minut, herrasi, palvelijoiden orjaksi.</td>
<td>Muistaos, Erin, miespolviais mennehiä ja muinaisia päiviä, miten kääntin isit in hiervät se elämän mun, ja sanain ääres, ja muukalaisen porteilleni saattoi huorin tekemään katsannossain lihomaan ja potkimaan kuij Jesus. Sen tähden olet sinä syndät tehnyt minun valoav vastaan ja satanut minut, herrasi, palvelijain orjaksi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

1 Thomas Mooren laulusta "Let Erin Remember the Days of Old" (vrt. 5. Moos. 32:7)
3 Sikiönkehitys. Äänet: neljännellä kauhelja sikiö alkaa kuulla. – Vrt. vastaava kohtaus Bunyanin Kristityn vaelluksessa.
att öva otukt inför mina ögon och att bliva fet och vällustig såsom Jesurum. Därför har du svåra syndat mot ljuset och gjort mig, din härskare, till dina tjänares slav. 

[...]

Vid detta framrönt ett buller på gatan, ack, sitt tack. Högt i det höga Tor tumlade: vild i vrede viggslungaren. Nu kom den åska som tystade hans mod. Och Magister Lynch menade det han borde upphöra med sin bespottelse och klokskap på nu den Allerhögste själv vredgades över hans kätteri och hedniska tal.205

Vid detta framrönt ett buller på gatan, ack, sitt tack. Högt i det höga Tor tumlade: vild i vrede viggslungaren. Nu kom den åska som tystade hans mod. Och Magister Lynch menade det han borde upphöra med sin bespottelse och klokskap på nu den Allerhögste själv vredgades över hans kätteri och hedniska tal.205

En svart smäll av skrammel på gatan där klack, någon tjöt ack. Högljutt till vänster dundrade Tor: i vrede vildg, hammerslungaren. Nu kom den åska som hyssjade hans hjärta. Och mäster Lynch bad honom ta sig i akt för trots och lättsinne, själve guden vredgades över hans helvetespladder och hednadom.206

What unites Milton, Taylor, and Browne is that they are representative of a Latinate prose style of the Stuart period. They are not, however, melded inseparably together, but rather Browne’s baroque eloquence and warnings against spiritual dryness are explicitly different from Taylor’s gradually unfolding sentences and solemn passages on virtue, and still noticeably different from Milton’s polemical Puritan prose of specifically the topical and socially aware *Arcopagita*.

In his 2007 book *Pastiche*, film studies scholar Richard Dyer considers both the montage or collage sense of pastiche, and the sense of a knowing imitation of a previous work. Even though Dyer’s (2007, 1) focus is on the aesthetic imitation, “the kind of imitation that you are meant to know is an imitation”, he considers the compilation sense of pastiche, and suggests naming it *pasticcio* pastiche. For Dyer, a pasticcio is a work put together of elements taken from elsewhere, and this putting together involves the quotation and imitation element of pastiche. This combination and imitation involves creativity and invention, in essence, criticism. In artistic pasticcio the “central notion is that the elements that make up a pasticcio are held to be different, by virtue of genre, authorship, period, mode, or whatever and that they

---

205 TWO, 377-8: “For you, Erin, must never forget your olden generations and your former days, how you despised me and brought a stranger to my gates to prostitute before my eyes, and to be fat and lustful as Jesurum. Therefore have you severely sinned against the light and made me, your ruler, to be the slave of your servants. [...] Here roared forth a noise in the street, alas, its thanks. High in the high Thor tumbled: wild with anger the bolt slinger. Here came the thunder that silenced his courage. And Master Lynch argued that he should stop his mocking and wiseacreing for now the Supreme being himself was angered over his heresy and pagan speech.”

206 EAU, 387-8: “Remember, Erin, your past ancestors and your days of old, how little you respected me and my words, and brought in a stranger through my gates to fornicate in my sight, and wax fat and kick like Jesurum. Therefore you have sinned against my light, and made me, your lord, slave under drudges. [...] A black bang of clatter on the street, alack, echoing clap. Loudly on the left Thor thundered: in anger mighty, the hammer slinger. Here came the thunder that shushed his heart. And master Lynch implored him to be wary of scorn and frivolities, god himself was angry over his hell chatter and paganism.
do not normally or perhaps even readily go together” (Dyer 2007, 10). The ingredients of the pie are mixed, but not melded together. In this sense Dyer’s compilation pastiche, or pasticcio, comes close to cento, an ancient Roman form of poetry, in which new poems were built as a patchwork from the texts of former famous poets, often for parodic purposes.

There is a difference in interpretation between the Swedish and the Finnish translations of “settedst little by me”. Warburton translates “du ringa aktade mig” – a very archaic, Biblical formulation meaning ‘to despise’ or ‘to hold in little value’. Andersson opts for “föga du aktade på mig” – and the equally archaic, perhaps folk-talesque formulation of ‘not following someone’. Saarikoski, however, translates “kun sinä pienenä istuit minun jalkaini ja minun sanaini juuressa” – meaning ‘when you were little and sat by my feet’, essentially the opposite of what I would consider the meaning here, and in discord with the following transgression of bringing a stranger to the gate. In a polyphonic dialogue, this (false) interpretation seems to be conveyed to Lehto not from the source text but from the earlier translation, as he too depicts Erin as a ‘little lad’.

There is an even more explicit change in style in the passage later on, starting with “A black crack[…]”, which Janusko (1983, 66) considers reminiscent of a passage in Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* depicting a dream rendering of the last judgement, but which could also be seen as a momentary regression into Old English monosyllabic alliteration. First translators Warburton and Saarikoski take the alliteration into consideration, but do not render a return to a more archaic monosyllabic form. Andersson does re-create an effect of alliteration and monosyllabic oxen hoofs. Lehto’s Finnish retranslation is even more verbose in the latter part of the passage than in the ‘Latinate prose’ part.

The Latinate prose is followed in the second trimester of the embryonic development of the ‘Oxen’ by the Bunyan pastiche, analysed above, a passage in the “diarystyle” of Pepys and Evelyn, after which Joyce uses Defoe’s *Colonel Jack* (1722), the story of a petty criminal, to describe Lenehan. The sixth month of embryonic development, the one in which, according to Janusko (1983, 5) and Joyce’s notes “the scrotum of the male fetus is empty”, there is a discussion in Swift’s anything but emasculated style about the Irish bull of “farmer Nicholas that was a eunuch” (*JU*, 327). As Gilbert (1952, 297-8) and Janusko (1983, 67-8) have shown, the specific
hypothesis of this passage is the *Tale of a Tub*, Swift’s satirical allegory of three brothers, Peter, Martin, and Jack, representative of the Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist clergy respectively, and their handling of the will and coats left to them by their father (God).

In Joyce’s pastiche farmer Nick is specifically Pope Adrian IV, and the bull is alternatively - or progressively - the entire Irish clergy, King Henry II, and finally King Henry VIII:

But one evening, says Mr Dixon, when the lord Harry was cleaning his royal pelt to go to dinner after winning a boatrace (he had spade oars for himself but the first rule of the course was that the others were to row with pitchforks) he discovered in himself a wonderful likeness to a bull and on picking up a blackthumbed chapbook that he kept in the pantry he found sure enough that he was a lefthanded descendant of the famous champion bull of the Romans, *Bos Bovum*, which is good bog Latin for boss of the show.

JJU, 328

As Janusko (1983, 68) notes, Joyce does not rely on quotation in his Swift pastiche - there are no direct quotations from *A Tale of a Tub*: “Joyce was perhaps well steeped enough in Swift’s style and vocabulary to construct his parody without benefit of notes.” The pastiche contract is fulfilled here by different levels of markers, most of which are related to content: this is the sort of satire Swift would have written, and this is the kind of subject matter he could have dealt with. Genette (1997, 121) notes, in connection to *L’Affaire Lemoine*, that imitation in pastiche extends to matters of content as well: “[E]ach one selects from the little news item the detail or the point of view that suits it, and these segments therefore cannot be entirely superimposed and seen as concurrent.” Nyqvist (2010, 156-7) reminds us that stylistic imitation is still essentially imitation of language: stylistic pastiches must imitate some content as well, but mere imitation of content is not a pastiche. For Joyce it rather seems that, instead of him choosing a hypotext to fit the content and direction of his narrative, each consecutive hypotext motivates not only the form or style of the narration, but also its content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutta eräänä iltana kun lordi Harry oli puhdistamassa kuninkaallista taljaansa mennyiseen päivälliselle voitettuaan soutukilvan (hänellä oli itsellään lapioairiot, mutta kilpaelin ensimmäinen sääntö oli, että toisten pitä soutaa heinähangoiolla), se huomasi merkilliselillä tavalla muistuttavansa hänkää, ja otaessaan mustaksi</td>
<td>Mutta iltanak muutamanikun lordi Harry istuik puhdistamassa kuninkaallista taljaansa mennyksen päivällisille voitettuaan soutukilvan (hänellä itsellään olivat lapioairiot, mutta kilpaelin ensimmäinen sääntö oli, että toisten pitik soutaa heinähangoiilla), sänkik huomasi merkillisetik kunä haerkä olevains, ja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first translators', Warburton’s and Saarikoski’s, translations are dynamically equivalent and communicative in accordance with their introductory and ethnocentric projects. Lehto translates here in the Finnish prose style of Carl Axel Gottlund (1796–1875), whose ambivalent, almost anarchistic written Finnish followed the spoken Finnish of the historical province of Savonia in the east of Finland. Lehto’s translation here is a masterful and humorous pastiche of Gottlund’s prose style, but

207 PSO, 393: “But one evening when lord Harry was cleaning his royal pelt to go to dinner after winning a rowing race (he himself had spade oars, but the first rule of the competition was that others had to row with hoes), he noticed he was strangely reminiscent of a bull and, taking a booklet, browsed dark, which he kept in a pantry, he found sure enough that he was the left-handed descendant of the famous Roman price-bull, Bos Bovum, which is good pig Latin and means boss.”

208 LLU, 448-9: “But one night when lord Harry sat down to clean his royal pelt to go to dinner after winning a rowing race (he himself had spade oars, but the first rule of the competition was that others had to row with hoes), he found himself to be strangely like a bull, and taking out a blackthumbed booklet which he kept in a pantry he truly discovered himself to be the left-handed descendant of the famous Roman prize bull, Bos Bovum, which is good pig Latin and means master of ceremonies.”

209 TWO, 384: “But then one night, said mr Dixon, when lord Harry cleaned his royal fur-coat to go to dinner after winning a race of rowing (he himself had broad oars, but it was carefully commanded that all his rivals must row with hayforks) he discovered how the he had a wonderful likeness to a bull, and later when he looked in a well-thumbed register he had in his cupboard he found out that he was a left side descendant of the famous champion bull in Rome, Bos Bovum, which is good pig Latin for colonel rasca.”

210 EAU, 393: “But it was one evening, says mr Dixon, when mister Henry brushed his royal pelt to go to dinner after he won a rowing competition (he himself had pad oars but the first rule of the race was that the others would row with hayforks) that he discovered in himself a strange likeness to a bull, and when he picked up a small well-thumbed booklet that he had in the pantry he realized that he no doubt was a left-handed descendant of the Romans’ famous champion bull, Bos Bovum, which is prime turf Latin for top cattle.”

211 According to Pulkkinen (1972, 16) he followed a decree stated by himself: “[K]irjuta niin kuin puhutaan! ja puhu niin kuin hoastetaan!” (‘Write as you speak! and speak as you jabber!’)
the content is still Swift’s, and is in contrast with the stylistic pastiche. Gottlund was a collector of folklore and lecturer of Finnish language at the University of Helsinki, not a satirist, and certainly not one interested or even knowledgeable in the relation of the English crown, the Catholic church and the Irish clergy. If Lehto were to follow his declared project of “doing exactly what Joyce did”, one could imagine a translation in which the chosen style of the pastiches from the history of Finnish prose styles would determine the content and events of the episode. This, however, does seem quite contrary to the prevailing horizon of translations, and general assumptions toward the translating position. It is hard to imagine a translation that would change content so drastically in favour of style or form.

5.2.4 Third trimester

By now it seems clear that Joyce’s techniques of imitation vary in this episode. Where one is able to find more quotation and more direct references to his hypotext, the hypertext tends more towards an imitation of a period or genre, and more towards a compilation pastiche of different textual materials normally held separate. In these passages Joyce’s notes, copied from Saintsbury’s *History of English Prose Rhythm* and William Peacock’s anthology *English Prose from Mandeville to Ruskin* (1903), seem to play a more central part. Where Joyce is more familiar and at ease with the author and text being imitated, such as Defoe or Swift, there is less direct quotation or allusion to be found. In using the style of Defoe, a writer we know Joyce held in high regard,\(^{212}\) to describe two of his less admirable characters, Lenehan and Costello, and the style of Swiftian satire in the politico-theological argumentation about Papal bulls, Joyce writes the sort of passages these two writers might have written on these subjects. Joyce refers less to any particular text or feature in the oeuvre of these authors, and more on a less readily available shared idea of their style.

Richard Dyer (2007, 55) has argued that the style imitated in a pastiche is in fact an impression or an image of that style: “The form of a pastiche’s likeness is subject to perception. A pastiche imitates its idea of that which it imitates (its idea being anything from an individual memory through a group’s shared and constructed remembering to

\(^{212}\) See e.g. Janusko (1983, 67): “According to Budgen, [Joyce] owned Defoe’s complete works and had read every line of them.”
a perception current at a given cultural-historical moment.” What is central is a shared idea between the writer (or in the cases of interest to us, the translators) and their audience. This of course means that a pastiche has to be perceived, the imitation has to be read into the text. Perhaps the best example of this kind of imitation of an idea in ‘Oxen’ is provided by a passage in which Joyce imitates the style of the 18th-century Romantic Gothic novel. Stuart Gilbert (1952, 306) mentions especially Horace Walpole and his The Castle of Otranto (1764) and, indeed, all the paraphernalia of the novel that begun the vogue of the literary genre in the latter part of the 18th century are present: drugs, graveyards, and curses:

He drank drugs to obliterate. For this relief much thanks. The lonely house by the graveyard is uninhabited. No soul will live there. The spider pitches her web in the solitude. The nocturnal rat peers from his hole. A curse is on it. It is haunted. Murderer’s ground.

By the times of the four translations, The Castle of Otranto had not been translated into Finnish or Swedish, although a Finnish translation Otranton linna was published in 2014. However, in this playful pastiche, the imitation of an idea of a genre proves quite natural for the translators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SAARIKOSKI</strong></th>
<th><strong>LEHTO</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WARBURTON</strong></th>
<th><strong>ANDERSSON</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 Ks. [13]. 417. 2 [6]. 124.

PSO, 404: “He takes drugs in order to forget. Great thanks for this release. The secluded house by the cemetery is uninhabited. Not a soul wants to live there. The spider spins its web in solitude. Rat of the night peeks out of its hole. A curse is on it. It has been bewitched. The murderer’s lair.”

LLU, 461: “He drank drugs to forget. Thanks for the release. The lonely house by the cemetery is empty. Not one soul wants to live there. The spider pitches its web in solitude. Rat of the night peeps out of its hole. There is a curse on it. It is distressed. The murderer’s land.”
All the translators seem to have no difficulty attaining the jocund imitation of the idea of Gothic fiction, even though there has been no Walpole hypotext in their respective languages to ground the imitation on. Individual lexical equivalences do vary though: Warburton’s lonely house is “förbannad” (‘damned’); for the three other translators it is the house which is haunted and a murderer’s home, but for Lehto it is the rat who is haunted or distressed, and the graveyard that is the murderer’s ground. The genre is in all the cases recognizable by the tropes in the text, and the period by the naïve style of attempting to create the affection of horror by repeating words such as ‘horror’ or ‘curse’. A possible exception to this is Saarikoski’s “Hän nauttii huumausaineita” (‘He takes drugs’) which seems too matter-of-fact and slightly anachronistic for the genre. The generic hypotext of the passage, and the jocundity and hyperbole of style could almost point to the parody-end of our pastiche-parody spectrum, but the text is still, as Dyer (2007, 53) formulates, a “false but plausible” imitation of the specific style of Walpole’s Otranto.

Perhaps surprisingly three of the translators have not markedly referred to another hypotext that lies in the passage: The quotation of “For this relief much thanks”, Francisco’s line from act I, scene 1 of Shakespeare’s Hamlet, which almost immediately precedes the appearance of the Ghost of Hamlet’s father in the night. Even though Hamlet is not of course part of the development of English prose, the Hamlet reference would seem to have a more general relevance to this passage and its ending, for in the scene in Hamlet Horatio declares himself and Marcellus to be “Friends to this ground”, and of course that ground, Denmark, turns out to be the land of a murderer, King Claudius – in other words the “Murderer’s ground”. By 1946, the first Swedish translation by Warburton, Hamlet existed in Swedish in three translations, and in Finnish in two different translations before the first Finnish translation of 1964. Yet only the Finnish retranslation, Lehto’s “Päästöstä kiitos”

---

215 TWO, 394: “He used opium to forget. Thanks for release. The lonely house by the cemetery now stands uninhabited. No soul wants to live there. The spider spins out its tapestry in solitude. A nightly rat glares out of its hole. It is damned. It is haunted by ghosts. A murderer's house.”

216 EAU 404: “He drank drugs to obliterate. Thank you for the release. The lonely house by the cemetery is uninhabited. Not a soul wants to live there. The spider weaves its net in loneliness. A nightrat peaks out of its hole. A curse is there. It’s haunted. Murderer’s home.”
would seem to refer to the standard Finnish translation of *Hamlet* (1879) by Paavo Cajander – “Päästöstä kiitän”.

Lehto’s Finnish retranslation superimposes on the imitations of English prose history new hypotexts from the history of Finnish prose. Moreover, by naming the hypotexts in the footnotes, he gives the impression of a clear-cut succession of un-ambivalent pastiches. On account of these strategies, Lehto sets himself the requirement of explicating all of the hypotexts of the pastiches. As the hypotexts Joyce refers to are, however, continuously debated and re-allocated, many contested hypotexts are left unmentioned, and perhaps the clearest omission is John Henry Newman. Already according to Gilbert (1955, 309) the passage in the style of Dickens is followed by “[p]assages in the manner of Newman, Pater and Ruskin”. In the following example, the beginning, according to at least Gilbert, Johnson, and Riikonen is in the style of Newman, and the latter part is in the serene and sensuous style of Walter Pater:

There are sins or (let us call them as the world calls them) evil memories which are hidden away by man in the darkest places of the heart but they abide there and wait.

*JU*, 344

This affective, oratory prose is followed in the next paragraph by a more romantic depiction of past halycon days:

A shaven space of lawn one soft May evening, the wellremembered grove of lilacs at Roundtown, purple and white, fragrant slender spectators of the game but with much real interest in the pellets as they run slowly forward over the sward or collide and stop, one by its fellow, with a brief alert shock.

ibid.

Riikonen (1985, 105) notes that for Joyce, Cardinal Newman was perhaps the foremost English prose writer. Newman was a Christian metaphysical thinker, whose style was reminiscent of 17th-century Anglican Church orators: “[L]ike them he composed for the ear, taking pains over rhythmic and syntactic organization as well as clear argument and distinct diction” (Alexander 2000, 257). Walter Pater, on the other hand, was a stylist and an aesthete uninterested in Christian doctrine. He was rather a worshipper of sensation and art. Together with the stylistic pastiche of the art critic John Ruskin, which follows, the pastiches of Newman and Pater may represent a
period pastiche of the masterful 19th-century Victorian style, but it is clear that this is a juxtaposition of very different writers and separate styles, and therefore is what we have called compilation pastiche. None of the Finnish and Swedish translations of the passage quite re-create this aspect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On syntejä tai (nimittääksemme niitä niin kuin maailma niitä nimittää) ikäviä muistoja, jotka ihminen kätkkee sydämensä pimeimmän pimentoinhin, mutta ne pitävät asuntona siellä ja odottavat. [...] Leikattu nurmikenttä lauhana toukokuun iltana, muistojen syre Roundtownissa, purppuranpunainen ja valkoinen, pelin solutuoksuiset solakat katselijat, jotka todella olivat kiinnostuneita kuulista kun ne hitaasti juoksivat nurmikon yli tai törmäsivät toisiinsa ja pysähtyivät, toinen toisensa kylkeen, lyhyesti ripeästi töksähtäen.</td>
<td>Onpa1 syntejä tai (kutsukaamme niitä nimellä, jolla maailma niitä kutsuu) pahoja muistoja, jotka ihminen piilottaa pois sydämensä synkimpin sopukoihin, mutta ne asustavat siellä ja odottavat. [...] Leikattu nurmikenttä lauhana toukokuisena iltana,2 hänen hyvin muistamansa syreenilehto Roundtownissa, purppuraa ja valkoista, pelin tuoksuvat solakat katselijat mutta kovin aidosti kiinnostuneina kuulista3 niiden hitaasti vieriessä surmen yli tai törmäessä ja pysähtyessä, kylik kylkeen, napakan valppaasti klaksahtaen.218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Kohtaus sama, jossa Menton hävösi Bloomille kuulapelissä, ks. [6].139.
3 Vrt. [6].139 ”Menetti malttinsa (…)”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Det finnes synder eller (låt oss nämna dem som världen nämner dem) onda minnen, vilka människan undangömmer i sitt hjärtas mörkaste vrå, men vilka i väntan leva vidare där. [...] En välklippt gräsmatta en mjuk majmorgon, den välbekanta syrendungen vid Roundtown i purpur och vitt, som en skara doftande, smärta åskådare fyllda av intresse för kloten som långsamt rulla över planen eller stöta samman och stanna intill varandra med en kort och plötslig småll.219</td>
<td>Det finnas synder eller (låt oss nämna dem som världen nämner dem) onda minnen som människan gömmer undan i hjärtats mörkaste ställen men där dröja de sig bidande kvar. [...] En välklippt gräsplätt en behaglig majkväll, den tydligt hågkomna syrenberåen i Roundtown, lila och vit, slanka väldoftande åskådare till spelet men med äkta intresse för kloten där de sakta rullade fram över gräset.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

217 PSO, 412–3: “There are sins or (to name them as the world calls them) unpleasant memories that a man hides in the darkest shadows of his heart, but they dwell there and wait. [...] A cut grass field on a pleasant May evening, a lilac grove of memories in Roundtown, purple and white, fragrant slender spectators of the game, who really were interested in the bowls as they slowly ran across the lawn or collided and stopped, one by one, with a brief alert bump.”
218 LLU, 470-1: “Indeed there are sins or (to call them by the name that the world calls them) bad memories, which a person hides away in the deepest crannies of his heart, but they live there and wait. [...] A cut grass field on an evening in May, a grove of lilacs he remembers well in Roundtown, purple and white, fragrant slender spectators of the game, but very genuinely interested in the bowls, as they slowly roll over the grass or crash and stop, side by side, crisply brightly snapping.”
219 TWO, 403-4: “There are sins or (let us call them as the world calls them) bad memories, which people conceal in the darkest nooks of their hearts, but which live on there waiting [...] A well-shaven grass lawn on a soft May morning, the familiar lilac grove in Roundtown in purple and white, like
For the first translators, Warburton and Saarikoski, the minimal formal change from the moral, metaphysical content of Cardinal Newman to the sensuality of Pater, fits the overriding project of their translations of this episode, which foregrounds the morphing compilation pastiche aspect of the text instead of recognizable, individual stylistic pastiches. Andersson’s Swedish retranslation, which I have argued to be both more a “Swedish Joyce” and more scholarly in its approach to the strangeness and foreignness of Joyce than Warburton’s first translation, is strikingly similar to its predecessor here, and is in fact slightly more modern and neutral in lexicon, shifting slightly from its archaizing tendencies elsewhere in the episode.

In his Finnish retranslation, Lehto explicitly designates Pater’s *The Child in the House* as the hypotext of the passage many commentators have considered to be a pastiche of Newman. It begs the question whether Pater could have “falsely but plausibly” written a passage on the inward affects of sin on the human soul. Considering his overall project in the episode Lehto’s translation creates a horizon of expectation of clearer stylistic differentiation of these two text materials compiled, or mixed, together, and an explication of the Newman hypotext in a footnote.

5.2.5. Tailpiece

After a passage in the style of the art critic John Ruskin, describing a nativity scene in the elevated style Ruskin would describe the architecture of a cathedral, “the word” is uttered, and the word is “Burke’s!”. For Janusko (1983, 76) this is “a stylistic imitation of the moment of birth”, and what follows is the messy afterbirth. I shall here use the term Joyce (LIII, 16) used of the beginning and ending of the episode in his letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver, the “headpiece and tailpiece of opposite chaos”.

scented, slender spectators filled with interest in the bowls, which slowly rolled over the pitch or collided and stopped next to each other with a short and sudden knock.”

220 EAU 413: “There are sins or (let us call them as the world calls them) bad memories that people hide in the darkest places of the heart, but they are left there biding their time […] A well-shaven plane of grass on a pleasant May evening, the distinctly remembered lilac arbour in Roundtown, purple and white, slender splendid spectators to the game, but with real interest in the bowls as they slowly rolled over the grass or crashed and stopped, one against the other, with a brief clear thump.”
The moment of birth is depicted in the style of philosopher and satirist Thomas Carlyle, “the last clear voice before the chaos with which this chapter ends” (Janusko 1983, 76). Curiously, Joyce places Carlyle as the last of his recognizable pastiches, out of chronological order. With the style of Carlyle, the evangelist of manual labour and spiritual exertion, it is possible to congratulate the father of the new-born baby, Theodore Purefoy, “the remarkablest progenitor barring none in this chaffering allincludning most farraginous chronicle” (JJU, 345).

This not altogether hidden metatextual reference to Joyce’s own episode of perpetual metamorphoses of style, with its implied questions of biological and literary fecundity, production and re-production, originality and copy, is followed by the afterbirth or tailpiece, which consists of the language of the street and public house, slang and drunken slur: “The last pages of this episode are a pandemonium of ejaculations in every form of dialect, jargon, slang, ancient and modern” (Gilbert 1955, 311):


JJU, 349

This is surely a stylistic imitation of a textual sphere outside many public houses straight after closing time, but can it be considered a pastiche? In our understanding of pastiche as the acknowledged imitation of another writer, acknowledging two authorities – the pasticheur and the author being imitated – this text is anonymous, emphatically missing an author. It is, however, a recognizable imitation of a specific discourse, which cannot really be described as a parody either.

If we were to study this passage as a specific stylistic imitation of spoken language in the oral tradition of this narrow spatiotemporal context, the question that would immediately arise is to what time and place should the translation of this passage be tied? There is polyphony in this passage: some voices are more onomatopoetic and bodily, some are verbally agile and witty. Here are the translations of this cacophonous choir:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The Finnish translators ground their translations on the street slang of their time:
Saarikoski’s translation resonates with mid-1900s urban slang, Lehto’s characters sound more millennial. The Swedish translations do not seem to be imitations of slang, but of spoken language with ejaculations, cut-off words and interjections. After the first two sentences which all four translators interpret as drunken ejaculations, there seem to be three different approaches to the slurred tongue twister “Leith police”: The first translators opt for generic, ethnocentric tongue-twisters, communicating mostly that the possible second speaker has not passed this sobriety test. Lehto wants to re-create the content of a policeman from Leith, losing the form of oral patter. The Swedish retranslators Andersson renders a double entendre in Swedish tied together by a rhyme “fis” – ‘fart’ and “kis” – ‘urine’.

The tailpiece is by no means all slang and dialect. There are different text materials – old and new, high and low. Janusko (1983, 76-7) finds even in the “afterbirth” correspondences to, among others, Swift and Macaulay, and quotations of popular song. In this example there are differences in the interpretations of “Mona, my thrue love”. The Swedish translators omit the misspelling and possible mispronunciation of ‘thrue’ and translate in an elevated style of possibly a lyrical ballad. Lehto’s “raakkauutein” – ‘loove of mine’ highlights the aural and singsongy

---

221 PSO, 418: “Attention! We’re not as crazy as that. Peter Piper picked a peck o’ pickled peppers. Pipped peckers. Watch out he’s starting to heave. Has something wrong with his stomach. Yooka. Good night, sweet Mona, my thrue love. Yook. Mona, my darling, Yook.”


reading of the passage, whereas Saarikoski’s “thosi rakkautein” – ‘my thru love’ is a
conventional marker of drunken speech.

The episode ends, after long and arduous labour pains, with the birth of an
enfant terrible, the language of the future. The last sentences of the episode are a
pastiche of an American-English business-oriented evangelistic phraseology. “The
episode closes in the manner of a dithyrambic American superhot-gospeller
conversation with a punch in it” (Gilbert 1955, 113):

Alexander J Christ Dowie, that’s my name, that’s yanked to glory most half this
planet from Frisco beach to Vladivostok. The Deity aint no nickel dime bumshow.
I put it to you that He’s on the square and a corking fine business proposition.
He’s the grandest thing yet and don’t you forget it. Shout salvation in King Jesus.
You’ll need to rise precious early, you sinner there, if you want to diddle the
Almighty God. Pfllaaap! Not half. He’s got a coughmixture with a punch in it for
you, my friend, in his back pocket. Just you try it on.

This is not a pastiche of a known author, but it is an imitation of a specific text: the
yellow throwaway leaflet of Alexander J. Christ Dowie, which has already been seen in
‘Laestrygonians’ announcing the coming of Elijah. Let us look at the interpretations of
this nightmare scenario of the future in the Swedish and Finnish languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

225 PSO, 419: “Alexander J. Christ Dowie has drawn to the path of salvation more than half of this planet from Frisco beaches to Vladivostok. God is not a five-penny game. I assure you he is fair and it is a profitable undertaking. He is the greatest and don’t you forget it. Cry hooray to King Jesus. You have to rise damn early, you sinner yeah you, if you are going to play with the Almighty God. Hoooonk! Nothing in half. He has for you, dear friend, in the back pocket the kind of medicine that thrusts. Please, have a taste.”

226 LLU, 477: “Alexander J. Christ Dowie, thatsmaname, has hauled to glory most of half the planet from Frisco beaches to Vladivostok. The Daity is not a five penny bluff strip. Believe you me He is a
Warburton has chosen to emphasize the influence of English on future language, which seems a fair assessment from the modern point of view, but still it is curious that he chooses to translate English phrases with different, presumably more recognizable English phrases: “O. K. och AAA business” for “on the square and a corking fine business proposition”, “biggest in the world” for “grandest thing yet”, and “Fiftyfifty” for “Not half”. In the episode the text of the throwaway is apparently read, interjected by a belch, and the retranslators Andersson and Lehto foreground the aural, spoken nature of the passage. Saarikoski’s future language resembles written language. The translations of “Pflaaap!” vary in register: for Andersson it is an onomatopoeic marker of a bodily function; Lehto foreignizes almost to the extent of not translating, and Warburton and Saarikoski have a curious ‘honk’, possibly of a car or a streetcar - an interpretation curious enough to perhaps suggest dialogue between the two translators, or Saarikoski possibly having compared and adopted what Warburton had in the Swedish translation. Similarly, both of the first translators omit “that’s my name”
earlier in the passage, another possible case of direct influence of Warburton’s translation having been on Saarikoski’s translator’s table.

5.3. Crime against fecundity

In his letter to Budgen, Joyce stated as the “idea” of episode 14, ‘Oxen of the Sun’, the “crime committed against fecundity by sterilizing the act of coition” (LI, 138-9). In the execution of this idea he commits a willing crime against literary fecundity, the 18th- and 19th-century idea of the author, of originality and literary influence, by writing an episode that is original with explicitly no originality, and which shows no respect for its literary influences by openly displaying its literary forefathers (and they are, all of them, literally forefathers). By this strategy, Joyce calls into question the writing subject of both himself and the earlier prose writers he imitates, and makes way for ambivalent, intertextual writing.

In the ambivalent and potentially subversive discourse of literature the concept of author, tied to the notions of individuality, originality and copyright, has, according to Michel Foucault’s What is an Author?, 1969, provided a sort of mauvaise foi (bad faith, to borrow existentialist terminology) disowning the innate freedom of literature: “How can one reduce the great peril, the great danger with which fiction threatens our world? The answer is: One can reduce it with the author” (Foucault 1998, 221).

Foucault reacts to the proclamation of the disappearance or death of the author in the writings of Kristeva229 and Barthes,230 and attempts to examine its consequences. In the essay, Foucault famously describes an author function, which plays a classificatory function in the narrative discourse, and also calls for a certain mode of reception: certain authorial names demand greater status in a given discourse. The author function allows us to organize the canon of literature, and the shelves in the library.

According to Foucault (ibid.), we are used to thinking that the author is “so transcendent with regard to all languages that, as soon as he speaks, meaning begins to proliferate, to proliferate indefinitely”. Instead of this proliferation, or fecundity, the author function is for Foucault a way of maintaining a thrift economy, of policing which texts are allowed into a discourse, and what can be expressed within the

229 Le mot, le dialogue et le roman, 1966.
discourse: “The author is therefore the ideological figure by which one marks the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning” (Foucault 1998, 222).

Translation is an intertextual, hermeneutic, and creative activity. In a reductionist and instrumentalist view of translation, where a translator occupies “the role of a ‘relay’” (Berman 2009, 64), as an invisible mediator of the original author according to the translation pact, a translation may uphold the author function, reducing the authorship of the translator to a sidenote. The author of the source text is the *locus* of the meaning of the text, all its denotations, connotations, and the literary history it rewrites. As long as the authorship of the translator is seen as subservient to the authorship of the original, translation is always doomed to fail, as it inevitably adds layers of interpretation and re-creation. But in the Bermanian view of (re)translation as a continuous positive process of transfer, or even the more recent view of “multiple translatorship” (Solum 2017, 42), in which various agents are involved in producing and mediating translated literature, translation challenges the author function, as the work goes beyond itself by its translations (Berman 2009, 100). In the polyphonic model our understanding of translations and retranslations of a given work as a *polyglot macrotext, a polyphonic hubbub* on the source text, the macrotext arrived at through the process of dialogue may be infinitely richer than the “original”, which is now only one voice in the polyphonic choir.

In his 1969 treatise *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault named the *historical a priori*, to which the texts of a certain period and culture refer, as the *archive*: 231 From the archive one can deduce what can be uttered in a certain historic discourse. The historical a priori is the positive unconscious of knowledge, the order underlying a given culture. 232 In the translations and retranslations of texts, and especially intertextual texts such as *Ulysses* and the ‘Oxen’ episode, which explicate and play upon their place in the archive, and operate on the verge of what can be

---

231 Foucault describes discursive practices or systems that establish statements as events and things: “They are all these systems of statements (whether events or things) that I propose to call archive.” (Foucault 1982, 128)

232 For Foucault, positivity of discourse plays the role of historical a priori, where polemical interchanges may be deployed: “Different *œuvres*, dispersed books, that whole mass of texts that belong to a single discursive formation – and so many authors who know or do not know one another, criticize one another, invalidate one another, pillage one another, meet without knowing it and obstinately intersect their unique discourses in a web of which they are not the masters, of which they cannot see the whole, and of whose breadth they have a very inadequate idea” (Foucault 1982, 126-7).
uttered within the discourse, the problem becomes how to cut the text from its historical a priori and appropriate it to a new context, culture and archive.\textsuperscript{233}

In this chapter I have analysed the polyglot macrotext of two Finnish and two Swedish translations of the pastiches of the ‘Oxen of the Sun’ episode, and asked how the cultural a priori of another language, time, and culture is re-created in (re)translation; how the imitation is imitated; what is the afterlife of the pastiches of ‘Oxen’, and how does the ‘Oxen’ go beyond itself in translation? In order to answer these questions, I have traced the hypotexts looming under Joyce’s pastiches, with the aid of commentators such as Janusko, Gilbert, and Johnson, and compared how these references are re-created in the translations of the episode. To demonstrate the connections, or lack thereof, I created the Oxen of the Sun hypertext (OSH), which employs tag words, sentences and formulations, to allow access to the polyglot macrotext to those who do not read these particular languages, and enables a comparison between the translations in two different languages by use of literal English backtranslations.

I then moved to consider the question in three interconnected areas: 1) What kind of intertextuality do the ‘Oxen’ pastiches represent? 2) What kind of strategies do the translators adopt to re-create these pastiches? and 3) How do the translations of the episode interanimate each other in a polyphonic macrotext?

To answer the first question, I found that there are several imitative strategies at play in the episode. Joyce constructs his pastiches differently according to the author or period imitated, and most likely according to his own attitude toward this hypotext. I found there were stylistic pastiches of a single, discernible author and a specific work, which corresponded with less direct quotation of the hypotext. When Joyce was familiar and comfortable with the style he was imitating, it was harder for me to point to specific links between the ‘Oxen’ hypertext and its hypotext. On the other hand, there were patchwork-like compilation pastiches that were comprised of combining very different text materials mostly from Joyce’s notes from Saintsbury’s History of

\textsuperscript{233} In calling for, and laying out the terrain for, a field of research called traductology (which seems to be something slightly different than the modern translation studies), Berman (1992, 182) defines it, not as a discipline, but as archaeology: “In fact, traductology, as a form or field of knowledge, could primarily be compared to Michel Foucault’s ‘archaeology,’ Jacques Derrida’s ‘grammatology,’ or the ‘poetology’ developed in Germany by Beda Allemann” (Berman 1992, 182).
English Prose Rhythm and Peacock’s English Prose anthology. In these patchworks of quotations and stylistic features, the links between hypertext and hypotext were more explicit. Between these two fell certain period pastiches of two or more authors, spiced, as it were, with quotations of other writers from the period.

Furthermore, there seemed to be a range of attitudes assumed toward the hypotexts. There are hommages in the tradition of classical respectful imitations, such as the Defoe and Swift pastiches. Some tended towards derisive literary critique, or even what could traditionally be called parody, such as the passages in the styles of Dickens and the Gothic novel. Finally, there seemed to be examples of pure ludic practice, of ambivalent literary play, such as the Bunyan imitation. Often I found that the translators had found it easiest to partake in the literary play, in which the pastiche relied not on the specific references or quotations but the shared image or idea of the style of the hypotext.

I compared the translators’ choices and strategies in ‘Oxen’ to the overriding translation projects as defined earlier in my work. During the course of the analysis, it became clear that Warburton’s approach to Joyce’s pastiches was very ethnocentric and, to borrow a term from Nida, dynamic. When there is a conflict of specific, but possibly confusing reference or familiar, invisible translation, Warburton chooses the latter. Saarikoski’s strategy proved an incoherent one: in some passages he aimed for philological accuracy, mostly he was assimilative, and at times he either succeeded or created further confusion with creative solutions. Andersson’s translation was creative and archaizing but added philological finesses dialogically to Warburton’s first translation. Lehto’s translation stood out with the choice to replace, or rather add, imitations of the history of Finnish prose style into the pastiches from the development of English prose. Whereas Lehto’s Finnish ‘Oxen’ was verbally brilliant, its conflicting projects of creatively rewriting the pastiches (or double pastiches) and philologically presenting the episode as a clear-cut succession of identifiable pastiches, the translation creates considerable confusion.

Finally, there was the question of polyphony between the four translations. I found the dialogue of the Swedish ‘Oxen’ to be complementary while the Finnish ‘Oxen’ were juxtaposed: As noted earlier, the Swedish retranslator Andersson used the first translation of Warburton as a “safety net”, comparing the two translations and then
choosing either his own interpretation, or substituting for his predecessor’s better choice, or creating a new alternative after this dialectics. The Finnish retranslator Lehto, who translated on top of his predecessor Saarikoski, “translating from Saarikoski to Joyce”, translates constantly as differently as possible from his predecessor. I found surprisingly little influence from Warburton to Saarikoski, and no ostensible influence from Andersson to Lehto, or vice versa.\textsuperscript{234}

\textsuperscript{234} Even though Andersson’s \textit{Ulysses} was published earlier than Lehto’s \textit{Ulysses}, Lehto’s project began considerably earlier than Andersson’s. Both were aware of each other’s translation projects, and to some extent of each other’s translatorial choices. (See appendices 1 & 2.)
6.

“A voiceless song sang from within”

Musicalization of fiction in ‘Sirens’

In episode 11 of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, ‘Sirens’, music is present everywhere. The scene is set in the bar of the Ormond Hotel at 4 p.m. The sirens, the “bronze” miss Douce and “gold” miss Kennedy are the barmaids, who lure (with various degrees of intentionality) “poor simple males” who visit the bar by their girlish giggles, trilling and humming songs, and by smacking a garter against their “warmhosed thigh” (a seductive trick Lenahan calls *Sonnez la cloche!* – “Sound the bell!”).

The Homeric referent of the episode is Odysseus’ encounter with the Sirens in book XII of the *Odyssey*. In the *Odyssey*, the beautiful goddess Circe gives Odysseus words of advice. She tells him he will next come to the Sirens, “who beguile all men whosoever comes to them” (l. 39) and hears their voice. The Sirens are creatures who sit in a meadow, amidst a great heap of bones, and beguile seafarers with their “clear-toned song” (l. 44). In order for them not to be lured by the Sirens’ song, Circe advises Odysseus to stop his men’s ears with sweet wax. Odysseus sets off, but, determined himself to hear the Sirens’ song, he has his men bind him to the mast with tight ropes. When Odysseus hears the Sirens’ clear-toned song, he bids his comrades to let him loose, but they, as pre-agreed, only bind him with more and tighter bonds, until they have passed the Sirens’ island. In addition to the Homeric subtext of the episode, the Gilbert schema provides correspondences for the bodily organ the ‘Ear’, the art of ‘Music’, and most famously the technique of ‘fuga per canonem’.

In the episode the Ormond Hotel bar is also the scene of an impromptu concert, with several characters performing parts of or entire well-known songs referred to in the text by quotations of the song lyrics. In fact, in his discussion of how Joyce uses music to orchestrate his major themes, Joyce scholar Zack Bowen (1974, 160-211) states that there are in total 158 references to forty-seven songs in the episode. There are a few songs that are followed through at length — songs which give
structure to the few events of the episode, and Bloom’s inner musings: Simon Dedalus sings the tenor aria *M'appari* (“When first I saw that form endearing...”) from Flotow’s romantic comic opera *Martha*, and the bass of Ben Dollard answers with a rendition of William B. Burney’s ballad, *The Croppy Boy*. The first is a story of unrequited love, the second of betrayal.

Leopold Bloom, as the Odysseus of the episode, sails past the Sirens, and their song, by dining in the adjoined dining room of the hotel, and listening to the concert through the open doors, but without taking part in the concert in the saloon or the seductive play with the barmaids at the bar. His inner voice is, however, constantly preoccupied with songs, music, and acoustics. Upon hearing Simon Dedalus singing *Martha*, he is reminded that he must write to “Miss Martha Clifford” in their increasingly provocative exchange of letters, and during the episode he muses on the nature of music as anything from vibrations to mathematics.

The main narrative event of the episode, the meeting Molly Bloom has with Blazes Boylan, and the likely extra-marital affair that ensues, is performed off-stage, and is only heard (or imagined by Mr Bloom) as the “jingle jaunted jingling” of the jaunting car Boylan is riding to 7 Eccles Street, and subsequently the “cockcarracarra” of the Blooms’ marital bed.

But the episode is not simply intertextually linked to known song-lyrics of the time, in addition to which characters, especially Bloom, and the (supposed) narrator discuss and think about music. The prose itself is transformed: There are onomatopoetic noises, word repetitions, the reduction of words into rhythmically repeated, syllabic units, and word agglutinations and combinations of letters with no lexical meaning. The episode appears to be governed by acoustics, not syntactics. It is said that in ‘Sirens’ Joyce attempts or even succeeds in blurring the line between literature and music, or that he translates music into literature.

From the perspective of the Polyphonic Translation Model, the question is this: If we can accept that Joyce’s ‘Sirens’ successfully imitates music, and that it structurally and phonetically adapts music into literature with any degree of success, then in this special case in the field of translations of intertextual material, is the hypotext looming under the surface of the hypertext in fact not another text but another medium? And if we could call ‘Sirens’ a translation of music into literature, what would it mean to re-translate that “intramedially” into another language?
Polyphony is a central component of the fugue form, in which two or more instruments or voices sound simultaneously, built contrapuntally upon a common musical theme. There are different traditions and views of the fugue form, but most include at least the subject—the main theme, answer—a modification of the subject, and contrapuntal counter-subject.\(^{235}\) Following the author’s cue, many commentators have searched for a common theme in ‘Sirens’, and have attempted to separate the voices or parts in the episode, which would then assume the roles of answer and counter-subject. Stuart Gilbert (1955, 253) considers both characters and actions in the episode to represent the voices: “The various themes are introduced in the fugal manner: the first, the Subject, is obviously the Siren’s song: the Answer, Mr Bloom’s entry and monologue; Boylan is the Counter-Subject.” Gilbert’s analysis has proved influential, but not “obvious”, however, as numerous commentators have found different themes and parts in the episode. What is more, one may well ask, is not equating a musical theme with a literary theme, or musical voice or part with a literary character, merely metaphoric uses of the terms?

In The Art of the Novel (1986), Milan Kundera discusses the possibilities of polyphony and counterpoint in the composition of fictive prose. On the one hand, he notes that as polyphony in music is the simultaneous presentation of two or more melodic lines, it remains to an extent a metaphoric application that literature, being unilinear, can never really meet (Kundera 1988, 71-96). On the other hand, Kundera argues that the novel form has always tried to escape the unilinear form, citing the stories within stories of Cervantes and the differing narrative lines of Dostoevsky:

Polyphony in music is the simultaneous presentation of two or more voices (melodic lines) that are perfectly bound together but still keep their relative independence. And polyphony in the novel? [...] If you analyze [The Possessed] from the purely technical viewpoint, you see that it is made up of three lines evolving simultaneously, each of which, if need be, could make an independent novel [...] They are bound together only by a common theme.
Kundera 1988, 74-5

While polyphony in literature, two or more voices and melodies ringing simultaneously in harmony, is practically impossible, there have been some successful attempts to hint at this technique. Kundera cites the narrative macrostructure of The...

---

\(^{235}\) See Imogene Horsley (1966, 6-37), who, in her study Fugue: History and Practice, both presents a model of an “academic fugue”, and points out the contrived model should never be mistaken for musical reality.
Possessed, and I would cite parts of Joyce’s ‘Sirens’, the opening and the ending being prime examples, to which I will return anon.\(^{236}\)

I have described the polyphonic view of translation as a choir (rather than a canon) of layered (if not simultaneous) competing or complementary voices. It would be tempting to extend the metaphor with the fugue form and argue that the source text is a theme or a subject and a translation is a modified imitation – an answer. In this analogy a retranslation might be assigned the role of a counter-subject. But would this just be extending a metaphor, which had no real grounds in the first place? Can music and fiction be compared as semiotic systems, and are there possibilities for interaction? What is the role of translation?

One classic conception of music as an art form is that it is “pure form”, pure signification without referent. Walter Pater, the 19th-century English essayist and literary critic, who was also one of the imitated authors of ‘Oxen’, wrote in his *The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry* (1873): “All art constantly aspires towards the condition of music. For while in all other kinds of art it is possible to distinguish the matter from the form, and the understanding can always make this distinction, yet it is the constant effort of art to obliterate it” (Pater 2010, 129). For this reason, music has also been considered the “international language”. In a simplistic view of translation, we assume the source text signifier referring to the signified being replaced by a target language signifier denoting the same referent, and then coping with possible losses or changes in connotation. But if the source text signifier imitates musical signification, traditionally held to be something else than denotative, essentially not having a signified, what should the target text signifier be tied to?

Because the possibility of the intermedial translation of music into prose is central to the question of the intramedial translations of that prose into other languages, it is worth taking a moment to consider the possibilities of this musico-literary translation. We know that James Joyce attempted some kind of transformation of his prose into the musical medium in this episode. Firstly, there is the textual evidence of musical themes, word music, and possible musical form preliminarily alluded to above and discussed at length below. Secondly, there is the contextual

\(^{236}\) Music and language scholar Katherine O’Callaghan (2018, 5) writes of ‘musical’ literature as the seminal modernist pursuit: “[M]odernist writers aspired towards the polyphony or ‘simultaneity’ of the musical art form, whereby multiple ‘horizontal’ strands can be performed simultaneously.”
evidence of the information he provided for the Gilbert schema, but also two key authorial indications conveyed by Ellmann. In his Joyce biography, Ellmann reports a discussion between James Joyce and Georges Borach, a friend and student of Joyce. Borach recorded some of his conversations with Joyce in his journal, and on June 18, 1919, he quotes Joyce stating: “I finished the Sirens chapter during the last few days. A big job. I wrote this chapter with the technical resources of music. It is a fugue with all musical notations: piano, forte, rallentando and so on” (Ellmann 1965, 473). In his own description, Joyce sees forms and effects of music in his episode, and especially the signifiers music is rendered to in its conventional written form, the form in which it could be considered to resemble more literature in its conventionally coded and printed form.

Ellmann (1965, 475) also quotes a letter from Joyce to his advocate and patron Harriet Shaw Weaver written later in the same year in defence of ‘Sirens’, following criticism from both Ezra Pound and Weaver herself: “They are all the eight regular parts of a fuga per canoneur and I did not know in what other way to describe the seductions of music beyond which Ulysses travels.” Here Joyce is interested in a larger structure of musical form, namely the fuga, as an organizing principle of his episode.

Both these constitute an authorial intention of musicalizing the prose of ‘Sirens’, but they do not seem to describe the main alienating and possibly musicalizing aspect of the reader’s experience of this section. To a reader it is not so much a question of the text imitating the written form or the structure of music, but that it highlights similarities of language and music in their acoustic, verbal form. ‘Sirens’ comes to life when it is read out loud.

Commentators rarely miss an opportunity to note Joyce’s early musical tendencies, such as, for example, Stuart Gilbert (1955, 241): “James Joyce himself, had he not chosen literature, would (as all who have heard him sing are convinced) have made his mark as a singer.”

Be that as it may, musicality and verbality of language was ever present in Joyce’s literary output, from the classical, lyrical, singsongy poems of his debut collection Chamber Music (1907) to stretching expressive possibilities of

237 In his 2009 book Music in the Words, composer and contemporary music scholar Alan Shockley lists Joyce’s reported musical capabilities: “Joyce himself possessed a much remarked-upon tenor voice and considered pursuing a professional singing career […] Joyce also was an avid opera enthusiast, could read music, and play the piano; all of these musical ties strongly color his writing” (Shockley 2009, 45-6).
prose in ‘Sirens’, and then to his final, thoroughly aural book *Finnegans Wake*, which can only truly be understood when read out loud. Surviving recordings of Joyce reading the ‘Aeolus’ episode of *Ulysses* (recorded in 1924) and ‘Anna Livia Plurabelle’ episode from *Finnegans Wake* (recorded in 1929), read in a lyrical, almost singing, manner, display this emphasis.

Even in their acoustic, aural forms, the “sister arts” of music and literature have been considered irreconcilably different as human cultural signifying systems. The musical signifier has been considered unable to have a hetero-referential, denotative meaning. On the other hand, it is hard to imagine a literary signifier free from reference to the signified, so that the musical form has been sometimes romantically considered the purest form of art, as we saw, for example, in the aforementioned quotation by Walter Pater. Historically, we know lyrical and epic poetry have their origins in close connections with music, and in their shared use of timbre, tone, and above all rhythm, they seem compatible to a degree, but the narrative prose form is still another matter. The French Anglicist Jean-Michael Rabaté, in an attempt at a non-musical interpretation of the ‘Sirens’ episode, significantly entitled “The Silence of the Sirens”, discarded all musical terms as arbitrary and criticized the very concept of ‘musicalization’, since, as he says, “no one will agree on the term” (1986, 82). For Rabaté, prose is incompatible with musical form, and musical imitation in prose is just a loose metaphor. My own approach to the matter is pragmatic: most readers do read music into ‘Sirens’ and, in fact, it is hard to read ‘Sirens’ without the evocation of music. It is therefore worthwhile to look how the hypertext of ‘Sirens’ alludes to its hypotext in the other medium.

If we look at the very opening pages of the ‘Sirens’ episode of *Ulysses*, we find that in fact Joyce has achieved something to the effect of non-denotative prose in what has been called the *prelude* or *overture* of the episode. The opening pages are a collection of 61 excerpts from the episode that follows it. In the rest of the episode Joyce gives more concessions to the narrative necessities of prose. Throughout the episode, however, Joyce uses different techniques to make music, as it were, appear in

---

238 Fritz Senn (1984, 203) calls these *thematic preparation*: “This unique overture frankly displays itself as a verbal artifact of juxtapositions; coincidentally, it also exaggerates that the whole of *Ulysses* is a redisposition of its material, a matter of internal transferences, of kaleidoscopic diversion.” For Senn, the medley of phrases that opens ‘Sirens’ falls under the category of Joyce’s ‘dislocations’. Pierce (2006, 116) and Gilbert (1955, 243) use the term *overture*.
the mind of the reader, and he tries to use musical form to break free from referentiality and narrative syntagmatics to the extent that cultural history and musicology scholar Nadya Zimmerman (2002, 108-118) has argued that musical form in the ‘Sirens’ chapter functions as a narrator. Before moving to the translations of musicalized fiction, it is necessary to clarify the terminology of intermediality, verbal music, and musicalization of fiction.

6.1. Verbal music, musicalization of fiction

The idea of musical art as beauty which does not presuppose concepts, can be traced back at least to Immanuel Kant’s 1790 work Critique of Judgment, where Kant categorizes musical art in the class of free beauty. More recently the inherent differences between musical and literary signification have been questioned: modern speech act theory, beginning with J. L. Austin’s work How to Do Things with Words (1975), shows us that linguistic meaning is by no means limited to denotative meaning, but that there are connotative, illocutionary, and perlocutionary meanings. Recently, the popular idea of the non-referentiality of music has also been undermined: Music can be seen to have illocutionary and perlocutionary meanings which attempt to express and impress connotations on an audience, and to have culturally assigned connotative meanings, if not even limited culturally specific denotation. The fact that musical expressive meanings are culturally constructed challenges the other age-old notion of music as the “universal language”. If the connotative meanings music creates are culture (if not language) specific, music is not universal after all, as it is not understood similarly everywhere.

Above, I proposed that the musical effect of Joyce’s fiction in the ‘Sirens’ can be felt, as has been commented, in the allusions to songs and song lyrics, and possible imitations of musical forms and ornaments, but mostly by the foregrounding of the aural and acoustic nature of language – word music. A similar three-part typology is theoretically formulated in the melopoetics of S. P. Scher, and his categories of musico-literary studies.

239 “Die erstere setz keinen Begriff vom dem voraus, was der Gegenstand sein soll” (Kant 1975, 310).
240 See e.g. Wolf 1999, 22-33.
In his 1970 article “Notes Toward a Theory of Verbal Music” German and comparative literature scholar S. P. Scher set out to explore manifestations of musical influence in literature such as word music, and structural and formal parallels.

Following Scher (2004, 25) one may differentiate between three possible general forms in which music and literature may appear together:

1) *music and literature* is a mixture of the two (vocal music),
2) *literature in music* is literature, as it were, turned into music (programme music), and
3) *music in literature* is musical influence in literature.

The aspect of *music in literature* Scher calls *verbal music*:

By verbal music I mean any literary presentation (whether in poetry or prose) of existing or fictitious musical compositions; any poetic texture which has a piece of music as its ‘theme’. In addition to approximating in words an actual or fictitious score, such poems or passages often suggest characterization of a musical performance or of subjective response to music. Although verbal music may, on occasion, contain onomatopoeic effects, it distinctly differs from word music, which is exclusively an attempt at literary imitation of sound. Scher 2004, 25-6

As we see in this passage, Scher is careful to make a distinction between *word* music and *verbal* music: for him word music is the literary imitation of sound, while verbal music seems to constitute a musical piece composed by means of literature (prose or poetry). Scher gives Aldous Huxley’s *Point Counter Point* as an example of verbal music, but it is easy to find an illustrative example from ‘Sirens’. As Mr Bloom walks into the bar of the Ormond Hotel, Mr Dedalus is ‘vamping’ on the piano to the tune of *Goodbye, Sweetheart, Goodbye*, a song by John L. Hatton, an English composer of glees and madrigals:

A voiceless song sang from within, singing:
―... the morn is breaking;
A duodene of birdnotes chirruped bright treble answer under sensitive hands. Brightly the keys, all twinkling, linked, all harpsichording, called to a voice to sing the strain of dewy morn, of youth, of love’s leavetaking, life’s, love’s morn.
―The dewdrops pearl...

*JU*, 217
The song is voiceless, Simon Dedalus is not singing, merely playing. He hears the voiceless song and the birds in his mind. Furthermore, we as readers do not even have the inner voiceless music of Simon Dedalus’ mind, merely the literary depiction of it. The literary depiction is giving the imagined musical signifiers what they have traditionally been considered missing: a denotative meaning.

In the passage the lightly played interlude is understood to denote the chirruping birds filling, as it were, a gap in the narrative of the song. The birdnotes converse with the song and call for the voice to sing the strain of dewy morn. At the beginning of the following verse, the voice answers the call. There is no onomatopoeia or word music, but an unmistakable sense of a musical subtext. How do the translators render the impression of an underlying song through the surface text of this verbal music?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Äänetön laulu lauloi sisältä, laulaen:</td>
<td>Äänetön laulu sisältä laulettu, lauloi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– … aamu koittaa.</td>
<td>– … aamu sarastaa. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Kastepisarat helmeilee... 241 (258)</td>
<td>– Kaste kimmeltää... 242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En röstlös sång sjöng inifrån, sjöng:</td>
<td>En röstlös sång infrånsjungande, den sjöng:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– … dagen bryter in.</td>
<td>– … morgonen gryr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En duoden av fågeltoner kvittrade klart diskantsvar under känsliga fingrar. Klart glittrade tonerna samman, harpoklingade alla, bad en röst sjunga visan om daggiga morgnar, om ungdom, om kärleksfärväl, livets, kärlekens morgon.</td>
<td>En tolvfingrad fågelsång kvittrade ett ljus glatt svar under känsliga händer. Det tindrande sammanlänkade harpospelets tangenter vädde glatt till en röst om att besjunga den daggfriska morgonen, ungdomen, kärleksavskedet, livets och kärlekens morgon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

241 PSO, 258: “A voiceless song sang from within, singing: / – … The morning comes. / A dozen bird-voices chirped bright treble answer under sensitive hands. Brightly the keys, twinkling, knotting, plunking, called the voices to sing the melody of dewy morning, youth, love, farewell, life, love’s morning. / – Dewdrops sparkle...”

242 LLU, 302-3: “Voiceless song sung from within, sang: / – … Morning breaks. [footnote] / A dozen bird’s tunes hummed bright treble answer under sensitive hands. Brightly the keys, flashing, knotting, plunking, called for a voice to sing a melody of dewy morning, youth, farewell of love, life, love’s morning. / – Dew glistens...”
The translators have to cope with the fact that, due to the temporal and cultural difference of the target audiences, the hypertext alluded to is likely to be less familiar to target text audiences. In another words, the song is less likely to start ringing in the ears of the readers of the translations than an English-speaking audience of the 1920s. Of the Swedish translations, Warburton’s translation sounds, through its more technical choices (‘fågeltoner’, ‘glittrade’), more like a simile (“the playing sounded like bird tones”), whereas Andersson’s choices (‘fågelsång’, ‘tindrade’) work like a metaphor (“what we hear is birdsong”).

The Finnish translations are very similar to one another, metaphors rather than similes. The most noticeable difference is Lehto’s footnote to ‘diskantissa’ – ‘in the treble’, presumably to make up for the lost connotation of ‘three’, ‘trio’, ‘threesome’ of the translation. The possible pair of ‘treble’ in the source text, ‘duodene’ (the duo that is never far from Bloom’s mind during the episode), is conveyed in Warburton’s translation.

This passage is poetic fiction with an existing piece of music as its theme. It is not, however, separate from the phenomenon of word-music. There is repetition (‘song’, ‘sang’, ‘singing’), word agglutinations (‘birdsong’), neologisms (‘harpsichording’). In fact, we can see all three kinds of musical presences in this passage of fiction: allusion to song lyrics, imitation of musical form and ornaments (‘duodene’), and acoustic word music.

In The Musicalization of Fiction, a 1999 study of musico-literary intermediality by literary and music studies scholar Werner Wolf, a typology of three main areas of what is called “covert musical presence in literature” (1999, 41) is offered: 1) thematization or ‘telling’, 2) evocation or ‘quotation of song lyrics’, and 3) imitation or ‘showing’. Wolf (1999, 60) accepts Scher’s coinages of ‘word music’ and ‘formal and

---

243 TWO, 256: “A voiceless song sang from within, singing: / – ... The day is breaking. / A duodene of bird tones chirped clear treble answer under sensitive fingers. Brightly twinkled keys together, harp-sounding all, asked for a voice to sing the song of dewy mornings, of youth, of love’s farewell, life’s, love’s morning. / – Dewdrops glisten...”

244 EAU, 263-4: “A voiceless song fromwithin sang, it sang: / – ... The morning dawns. / A twelvefingered birdsong chirped a bright cheerful answer under sensitive hands. The twinkling linked harp strings pleaded cheerfully for a voice to sing the dewy morning, youth, love’s farewell, life’s and love’s morning. / – Dewdrops glittering...”
structural analogies’, but criticizes ‘verbal music’ as an unfortunate term, firstly because it is apt to create confusion due to its similarity to the term ‘word music’, but mainly because it is not typologically on the same level as word music and structural analogies, confusing “referential aspects [...] with functional and technical aspects” (emphasis original). As ‘word music’ and ‘structural analogies’ are specifically techniques a writer may opt to employ to create the impression of music in literature, I find that Wolf’s suggestion as the third mode of imitation of music in literature more viable. Wolf adopts the technical viewpoint and names the technique ‘imaginary content analogies’. Imaginary content analogy is a literary technique a writer can adopt to imitate a subjective experience of music, an imaginary content of musical sequence as illustrated by the example from the ‘Sirens’ chapter above.

Wolf embeds his typology of musicalization of fiction in a comprehensive theory of intermediality. Wolf defines intermediality as follows:

[A] particular relation [...] between conventionally distinct media of expression or communication: this relation consists in a verifiable, or at least convincingly identifiable, direct or indirect participation of two or more media in the signification of a human artefact.

Wolf 1999, 37

Wolf’s study is a typology of methods by which music can participate and has participated in the signification of fictional prose. Intermediality is further divided into overt or direct intermediality, which corresponds to Scher’s music and literature in that the work under consideration appears as a medial hybrid, and covert or indirect intermediality, which corresponds to Scher’s music in literature. By Wolf’s taxonomy, Joyce’s ‘Sirens’ would be a case of covert intermediality in which the dominant medium is prose and the subordinate medium music.

A further advantage in Wolf’s typology in the light of the study at hand is the fact that, unlike many other surveys of musico-literary relations, it concentrates on the musicalization of fiction, not on poetry (a distinction Scher does not make), and specifically the possibilities of musicalization of narrative fiction. It is therefore

245 In Wolf’s (1999, 41) formulation: “[T]he participation of (at least) two conventionally distinct media in the signification of an artefact in which, however, only one of the media appears directly with its typical or conventional signifiers and hence may be called the dominant medium, while another one (the non-dominant medium) is indirectly present ‘within’ the first medium.”
advantageous to use Wolf’s terminology as the basis of my analysis of the translations of musicalized prose in James Joyce’s ‘Sirens’.

6.2. Translating the siren song

If a total musicalization of fiction were possible, then presumably that fiction, being in the “international language” and lacking referential meaning, would not need to be translated. However, in ‘Sirens’, just as in any imaginable actual musicalized fiction, where prose fiction is the dominant medium and music the non-dominant one, imitations of music are necessarily in secondary position. Moreover, as horizontal narrative development remains the norm, translating musicalized prose would at first seem reminiscent of translating poetry. Lyrical language remains denotative and referential, but aural aspects of rhythm, tonality on the one hand, and associative tropes, figures, and repetitive motifs on the other, assume a heightened value, and challenge the referential element.

The Jena Romantics strove to allow philosophy to go beyond itself by making it poetry, and allow poetry to go beyond itself by making it music, “to make the words sing philosophically in a musical and mathematical composition, where the song of the words is that which abolishes their limited meaning and gives them an infinite meaning” (Berman 1992, 96). According to Berman (1992, 134), in the thinking and translations of A. W. Schlegel, the forms of poetic language (rhythms and metres) are reproducible in another language to a certain extent, but the extent that they are not transferable, is the extent in which they expose the limitations of the target language, culture, and aesthetics, and that untranslatability is precisely the most important reason to attempt a translation: “Which is to say (precisely in Novalis’s sense): The more poetic a text is, the more it is theoretically translatable and worthy of being translated.” This line of inquiry might be used in the polyphonic study of translations of musicalized prose. It is precisely the untranslatable musicality and strangeness which is of interest in the translations and retranslations of ‘Sirens’. This is a special case of the polyphonic study of translated literature, since here a translator is working not only on the boundary of languages and cultures, but also between two different media and systems of signification.
As noted above, Wolf (1999, 70) divides *musicalized fiction* into three categories: 1) thematization, 2) evocation, and 3) imitation. Each of these categories, the depiction of music in the mode of ‘telling’, ‘quotations’ of song lyrics, and depictions in the mode of ‘showing’, present different kinds and different degrees of problems for the translator. Below, I discuss with examples the translations of musicalized fiction in these three categories presented by Wolf.

6.2.1. Textual thematization & evocative allusion

In James Joyce’s ‘Sirens’ music is almost constantly the topic of conversation, or the theme of the inner monologue. According to Wolf’s typology, in this form of musical manifestation in fiction the non-dominant medium, music, appears as the theme of the dominant medium, literature. In another words, in the narrative, music is discussed in the mode of ‘telling’:

> This ‘other’ medium may be indirectly present in a work merely as a signified or as a referent, whereby the signifiers of the dominant medium are used in the way customary and typical of it and only serve as a basis of this signification without being iconically related to the ‘other’ medium; this is the case in what I call the explicit ‘thematization’ of a non-dominant medium in the mode of ‘telling’.

Wolf 1999, 44 (emphasis original)

Explicit thematization can occur *intratextually*, when music is discussed or listened to by the fictional characters in the text, *paratextually*, when music is discussed in the paratexts, such as titles, forewords or footnotes, or *contextually*, when music is discussed in the context of a work, for example in an author’s letters commenting on the work.

In the case of Joyce’s ‘Sirens’, the question of contextual thematization relates naturally to Joyce’s letters discussed above, and all the research on Joyce, ‘Sirens’ and musicalization published, beginning with Gilbert’s 1930 study. In the case of the translations it is an interesting problematic to consider how much contextual knowledge a reader of each translation might be expected to have, and how that knowledge affects the reading experience of the episode. Warburton and Saarikoski published their translations before much of the scholarly research and reading companions published on *Ulysses*, and since their translations also lack much of the
paratextual thematization of footnotes, forewords and explanations, their audience is largely reliant on intratextual evidence of the possible musicalization of ‘Sirens’.

As for paratextual thematization, Lehto’s Finnish retranslation of 2012 sets itself apart from other translations under scrutiny. In Lehto’s translation, original contextual thematization (quotes from Joyce’s letters, allusions to research, etc.) is mediated as paratextual thematization to the margins of the text through Lehto’s extensive footnotes. Lehto has created some contextual thematization himself for his translation of ‘Sirens’ since he has discussed extensively translating the musicalized prose of ‘Sirens’ in articles and interviews. \footnote{Lehto being a poet known for sound poetry, ‘Sirens’ was the episode with which the entire project of retranslating \textit{Ulysses} into Finnish began (cf. Niskanen 2010, 9-14; Luoma-aho 2009, 17).} Readers of Warburton, Saarikoski, and Andersson do not even have the paratextual clue of the episode title ‘Sirens’ to alert them to look out for possible signs of voice, song, or music in the episode. One should again remember that the original reader of the 1922 Shakespeare and Company \textit{Ulysses}, or the 1986 Gabler edition, does not have that paratextual clue either, although the English-speaking reader of most modern editions of \textit{Ulysses} would have at least that.

Intratextual thematization is perhaps the most obvious and most frequent musical presence in ‘Sirens’. Music is discussed throughout ‘Sirens’ on the narratorial level and by the fictional characters, and the text of the episode alludes constantly to known songs, singers, and songwriters.

To take an example of music thematized in the voices of the characters in the episode, towards the end of ‘Sirens’, as Bloom is already making his way out of the sirens’ den, Ben Dollard has just ended his performance of the ballad \textit{Croppy boy} and is receiving praise from his audience at the bar, especially by being compared to “Lablache”:

—Better, said Tomgin Kernan. Most trenchant rendition of that ballad, upon my soul and honour it is.
—Lablache, said Father Cowley.
Ben Dollard bulkily cachuchad towards the bar, mightily praisefed and all big roseate, on heavyfooted feet, his gouty fingers nakkerin castagnettes in the air.

\textit{JU}, 235-6

\footnote{Lehto being a poet known for sound poetry, ‘Sirens’ was the episode with which the entire project of retranslating \textit{Ulysses} into Finnish began (cf. Niskanen 2010, 9-14; Luoma-aho 2009, 17).}
Luigi Lablache, a Victorian era bass, would, by the time of the publication of Joyce’s novel, have been dead for 64 years. Certainly to the audiences of the four translations his name will not work as an allusion to a known bass, nor work as a praise for bass singing, but will rather seem like one of the instances of word music in the episode, a combination of letters with no lexical meaning. Yet no translator has opted for a substitution of a common noun, something to the extent of “master bass”, for example, or possibly an addition of an explanatory prefix. Lehto’s translation carries the lost information in the paratext of a footnote.

---

247 At the time of narration, 46 years. Yet it is possible that Father Cowley would remember him, and in any case, as Gilbert (1955, 241) and others have pointed out, Dubliners were prone to reminisce over the heroics of quite old singers.

248 PSO, 282: “ – Better, Tomgin Kernan said. – Very heart-rendering interpretation of that ballad, on honour and conscience. / – Lablache, said father Cowley. / Ben Dollard stoutly chupchupchupped toward the bar, fed with mighty praise and ruddy all over, with heavy-footed feet, gouty fingers nakkering as castanets in the air.”

249 LLU, 328: “ – Better, Tomgin Kernan said. The most expressive interpretation of that ballad, on my soul and honour, truly. / – Lablache[footnote], said father Cowley. / Ben Dollard dumpily chipchipchutted toward the bar, with lavish praises fed and ruddy all over, with heavy-stepped feet, gouty fingers nakkering castanets in the air.”

250 TWO, 277-8: “ – Better, said Tomgin Kernan. A magnificent rendition of the ballad, upon my soul and honour. / – Lablache, said Father Cowley. / Massive cachuchad Dollard toward the bar, mightily praise-fed and rosy, on heavy-footed foot and snapping gout castanets in the air.”

251 EAU, 286: “ – Better, said Tomgin Kernan. A particularly scathing interpretation of the ballad, on my honour. / – Lablache, said Father Cowley. / Ben Dollard cachuchad hefty toward the bar, scarlet
Intratextual thematization can allude to real or fictional music, and be known or unknown for both or either the source text reader and the target text reader, and present the translator with different degrees of difficulty respectively, but still even in this passage the most interesting differences in interpretation come from the word agglutinations “praisefed” and “heavyfooted” and the word music of “cachuchad” and “nakker”. The four translations illustrate that the word music of “cachuchad” is as such acceptable in prose rendered in Swedish, but seems to need translation into Finnish. Saarikoski has chosen “tsuptsuptsuppassi”, reminiscent of shuffling feet, whereas Lehto’s “tsiptsipsutti” has the surprising connotation of walking lightly, even on tiptoe (‘sipsutti’).

We can also look at an example of fictional intratextual thematization from the inner voice of Leopold Bloom:

Brasses braying asses through uptrunks. Doublebasses, helpless, gashes in their sides. Woodwinds mooing cows. Semigrand open crocodile music hath jaws.

Woodwind like Goodwin’s name.

JJU, 233

Earlier in the episode Bloom has erroneously quoted Shakespeare having written “Music hath charms”, which motivates in this passage of inner monologue the “music hath jaws” together with the image of an ‘opened semigrand’ as a crocodile. Of the translators Warburton and Lehto seem to re-create the connection through rhyme, and still maintain semantic meaning of ‘a gaping mouth’ and ‘jaws’ respectively. In Saarikoski and Andersson the connection is unmarked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

large and stuffed with praises, on heavy-footed feet, the gout stiff fingers castanet nakker in the air.”

252 PSO, 279: “Horns donkey’s noses bray into your ears. Doublebasses, helpless, open wounds in their sides. Woodwinds cows moo. Grand piano open crocodile music has jaws. Woodwind reminiscent of someone’s name.”

188
The other fictive intratextual thematization in the passage is the reference to “Poor old Goodwin”, a pianist mentioned earlier in the episode. The Swedish translators have resorted to identical, and yet absolutely opposite recourses: Warburton has taken the word “woodwind” and substituted his own Swedish pun, omitting the reference to Goodwin. Andersson has punned on “Goodwin”, and omitted woodwind. Saarikoski seems to have thrown his hands in the air and translated ‘woodwind’ reminding Bloom ‘of someone’s name’, and Lehto has made a laboured attempt to re-create all semantic meaning and alludes to the tonal form by adding ‘u’ and ‘g’ phonemes into the words. For this very alienating, estranging translation Lehto adds a footnote.

In ‘Sirens’, Joyce frequently attempts to re-create the experience of music in his reader by quoting known song lyrics. The second main category of musicalization of fiction in Wolf’s typology is the evocation of vocal music through associative quotation. In this form of musicalization the music referred to must be itself intermedial in nature, namely vocal music with song lyrics:

> [F]ormulated in a general way, this is technically done by transferring material of the medial component that both media share (in the case of vocal music: verbal text), by means of (total, partial, direct or indirect) **quotation** from the medially hybrid ‘source’ work into the ‘target’ work, so that the source work, including its other, non-quoted medial component, is thereby evoked through **association**.
>
> Wolf 1999, 67 (emphasis original)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warburton</th>
<th>Andersson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---


255 EAU, 283: “The brass donkey screaming with raised trunks. Helpless basses, cut, in the sides. Woodwinds mooing cows. Semigrand piano gaping crocodilie music has bite. Good wine for Goodwin.”
As this intermedial device involves quotation, in this form the musicalization of fiction comes very close to literary intertextuality. It is therefore to be expected that this form of musico-literary intermediality shares common ground with intertextuality as to the problems presented to the translators: the differences of cultural background and temporal distance of the source text and target text audiences, and the recognizability of the quotation. If the target audience cannot recognize the quotation, the reference cannot evoke the music in the mind of the reader, and hence, by Wolf’s definition, the passage is no longer musicalized. Further, if the reference is not marked by quotation marks, stanzas or italics, the target text reader might not even suspect there is a quotation in the text.

As noted above, up to 158 references to recognizable song lyrics have been identified in ‘Sirens’. The problem of recognition is a constant problem for both the target language and the modern source language reader of Ulysses, just as it is in intertextual allusions, but the situation is ever more complex when the existence of the allusion is a debated point:

—What's that? Mr Dedalus said. I was only vamping, man.
—Come on, come on, Ben Dollard called. Begone dull care. Come, Bob. He ambled Dollard, bulky slops, before them (hold that fellow with the: hold him now) into the saloon.

_JJU_, 220

The anonymous drinking song _Begone, dull care_ from the 17th century is mentioned by most commentators, but there is certainly no reason why it could not be a straightforward suggestion by Ben Dollard to Simon Dedalus to cheer up and sing a tune. Most of the song titles, such as _A Last Farewell_ by John Willis on the same page, are marked by italics in the 1922 and the 1986 Gabler edition text, but “Begone dull care” is not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Lehto makes an explicit connection to the drinking song by using archaic language and providing an explanatory footnote. The other three translations are more ambivalent, like the source text, and the phrase could operate as an evocation of a song title or a cheerful imperative. Later in the passage Andersson has interpreted Joyce’s verb ‘hold’ to mean ‘to take hold’, whereas others choose ‘to behold’ as the interpretation.

Another question is of course an evocative quotation that is willingly or unwillingly misquoted, as miss Douce does in ‘Sirens’:

Gaily miss Douce polished a tumbler, trilling:

– *O, Dolores, queen of the eastern seas!*  

Miss Douce quotes the lyrics of an aria from Leslie Stuart’s opera *Floradora*, “Oh, my Dolores”, possibly intentionally implying she (‘I’) is the female addressee of the aria, or by mistake by the character, narrator, author or, indeed, the French-speaking typesetter of the original 1922 Shakespeare and Company edition.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hän kävellytti Dollardin, lökäpöksyt, heidän edeltään (katso nyt tuota joka on kanssasi: katso häntä) saliin.</th>
<th>Hän asteli Dollard, lökäpöksy, heidän edellään (katso tuota kaveria jolla on: katso häntä nyt) saliin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WARBURTON</strong></td>
<td><strong>ANDERSSON</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Han rullade Dollard, säckigt klädd, framför dem in (titta på den där karlen med de: titta bara) i salongen. | – Vadå? sade mr Dedalus. Jag bara klinkade.  
Han släntrade efter Dollard, blysiga byxor, först in (hejda mannen med de: hejda honom) i salongen. |

---

256 PSO, 262: “– What now? Dedalus said. – I only tinkled a little. / – Well, come on, Ben Dollard shouted. – Away with sorrow and grief. Come, Bob. Bob. / He walked Dollard, baggypants, before them (look at the one with you: look at him) into the saloon.”

257 LLU, 306: “– Oh no, Dedalus said. I was only tinkling a little, see. / – Never mind, on with it, Ben Dollard exclaimed. Begone dull care.[footnote] Come, Bob. / He walked Dollard, baggy pant, ahead of them (behold that guy with: Behold him now) into the saloon.”

258 TWO, 259: “– What’d’ya say? said Dedalus. I tinkled only. / – Go on, go on, shouted Ben Dollard. Away with the gloom. Come, Bob. / He rolled Dollard, baggily dressed, in before them (look at that man with the: just look) in the saloon.”

259 EAU, 267: “– What? said Mr. Dedalus. I just tinkled. / – So so so, cried Ben Dollard. Away all worries. Come, Bob. / He sauntered after Dollard, baggy pants, first in (stop that man with the: stop him) in the saloon.”

---

191
Iloisesti neiti Douce killoitti kolpakkoa, liverrellen:
- Oi, Madolores, kuningatar itäisten merten?260

Iloisesti nti Douce puunasi juomalasia, liveriän:
- Ah, Madolores,1 kuningatar idän aavain!261

1 Idolores. Nti Douce muuttaa sanoja. Säe on aariasta “The Shade of the Palm” Leslie Stuartin koomisessa oopperassa Floradora (1899): “Oh, my Delores, queen of the eastern sea, / Fair one of Eden look to the West for me, / My star will be shining, love, / When you’re in the moonlight calm, / So be waiting for me by the Eastern sea, / In the shade of the sheltering palm.”

2 Knowles 1999 – Sopraano II, lauletut laulut ja laulunpätkät.

WARBURTON

Glatt blankade Douce ett dricksglas, drillade:
- O. Idolores, drottning i österhav!262

ANDERSSON

Glatt drillade miss Douce glasputsande:
- O. Idolores, drottning av österns hav!263

Interestingly both the Finnish first translation and retranslation seem to take this misquotation into consideration, the Swedish translations do not. Saarikoski and Lehto translate with “Madolores”, which could be seen to include “Ma”, an archaic, literary, lyrical form of the Finnish first-person singular pronoun ‘minä’. To decode this meaning, however, the reader of the target text would need to compare the translation with the source text or be familiar with the lyrics of the alluded song. Of course, Lehto explicates these in a footnote.

In the light of these examples, the thematization of music in fiction and the associative quotation of song lyrics certainly represent musical presence in fiction but are not really enough to create the impression of musicalization of fiction. Also, the translations of these passages bear the same problematics as intertextual allusions. Of the alienating and musical aspects of ‘Sirens’ we have thus far looked at allusions to songs and quotations of song lyrics. I argued, however, that the most alienating and innovative musicalization of fiction involves imitations of musical forms and

260 PSO, 256: “Gaily Miss Douce polished a tankard, warbling: / – Oh, Medolores, queen of the eastern seas!”

261 LLU, 300: “Gaily Ms. Douce buffed a drinking glass, chirruping: / – Ah, Medolores,[footnote] queen of the eastern oceans!”

262 TWO, 254: “Cheerfully Douce shined a drinking glass, trilled: / – Oh, Idolores, queen of the east sea!”

263 EAU, 261: “Cheerfully trilled miss Douce glass-polishing: / – Oh, Idolores, queen of an eastern sea!”
ornaments, and the foregrounding of the aural and acoustic nature of language – word music. These techniques fall under what Werner Wolf calls imitation or the mode of showing, which for him is a core area of musicalization of literature.

6.2.2. Imitation & word music

Implicit imitation (showing), the third main mode of covert intermediality alongside thematization (telling), and evocation (quotation), is according to Wolf (1999, 57) musicalized fiction proper: “The opposed form, imitation, according to our definition, is an implicit form of covert intermediality in which some kind of iconic similarity between (parts of) a work characterized by one medium and another medium suggests the presence of this second medium within the (dominant) first one.”

The reference point of the imitation may be either a common musical form or structure, or a specific musical work. In the case of Joyce and ‘Sirens’, following his aspiration to make his work an encyclopedia or a medieval summa (as influenced by Thomas Aquinas), the hypotexts of most of the intermedial material are general musical forms and structures.

Wolf further divides imitation/showing into three sub-categories: imaginary content analogies, micro- and macrostructural analogies, and word music. I discussed imaginary content analogies briefly above in relation to Scher’s verbal music. I noted that the usual contention is that whereas a linguistic signifier can never rid itself from its signified, a musical signifier cannot have a denotative meaning – although some musical signifiers may be considered to have a conventional, culture-specific connotation: “In contrast to word music and structural analogies, imaginary content analogies supply what is tendentially absent in music: a referential content” (Wolf 1999, 63). Imaginary content analogies are a strategy of musicalized prose, whereby a piece of music is given an imaginary signified.

By use of poetic language, imaginary content analogies attempt to create an imitation of musical experience. The border between imaginary content analogy and the thematization of music is not always necessarily a clear one. The following example from ‘Sirens’ will demonstrate a case in which it is a question of interpretation whether the musical signifier is given imaginary content, or whether a specific, intermedial content of an operatic aria is being referred to. Separating
between the two must obviously influence the translational rendition. In the Ormond Hotel bar, Father Cowley plays an F sharp major chord:


What creates the musicalization here? There is theThematisation of the ‘dark chord’ of F sharp major. The repetition of deep guttural noises ‘gugugu’ imitates the ‘low’ sound. The ‘cave of the dark middle earth’ gives imaginary content to the musical signifiers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 Brown/Gilbert – (6) kontrapunktien verkko, kuulijoiden reaktiot Dollardin lauluun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The first translators, Warburton and Saarikoski, render the imaginary content analogy of ‘low’ and ‘dark’ for the chord. Johnson (1998, 880), however, offers an alternative reading for the passage. According to her, the chord reminds Bloom of Richard Wagner’s Das Rheingold, especially Wotan’s descent to Alberich’s cavern to retrieve the Rhinegold. Andersson’s “midgård” and Lehto’s “keskinen maa” (‘middle earth’) seem to hint towards Germanic cosmology and Norse mythology.

Then there is the mysterious “lumpmusic”. It could refer to a ‘small mass’, or ‘a swelling or a growth on the body’, or of course a ‘lump of ore’. The Swedish

---

264 By this time, we have grown sensitive enough to deduce musical overtones in the setting of the musical chapter of the book in a bar.


translators have seen this as a small ‘clump’ or ‘a clot’. Of the Finnish translators, Saarikoski has made the interpretation of ‘raw’ and Lehto ‘disposable’. In the ‘Sirens’, the narrative hypertext follows the train of the musical hypotext and thus earlier interpretations (specific thematization of subjective imaginary content analogy) cast their shadows on further interpretations.

Structural analogies are a strategy of musicalized prose to make references to musical form: “In ‘formal and structural analogies’ [...] music emerges as a signified with respect to music as a form” (Wolf 1999, 58). This effect can be achieved by highlighting the material or phonetic nature of a text, or by using unconventional syntax. A text may imitate the microstructures of music, e.g. echo, ostinato, or modulation. On the other hand, a work of prose may imitate a macrostructure of music, e.g. a fugue or a sonata.

According to Gilbert (1955, 240–253) the technique of the episode is fuga per canonem, fugue according to rule, in which he sees the Subject, Answer, Counter-Subject, and the Divertimenti of the fugue, all bound together contrapuntally. The fugal form of the episode has been widely discussed after Gilbert’s study. Wolf (1999, 130) dedicates a section of his study in the theory and history of musicalization on imitation of music in ‘Sirens’. He questions the very term fuga per canonem, noting that no single clear canonical form of fuga exists, and “[e]ven more problematic is the phrase ‘eight regular parts’. What does ‘part’ mean?”. Wolf sees the episode as a three-part fugue, with the subject of ‘desire’ (in particular ‘sexual desire’), with the inversion ‘disgust’, and counterpoint ‘unfulfilled lust and loneliness’. Zimmerman (2002, 111), on the other hand, has argued the fugue form plays the part of narrator in the episode, and recognizes the eight parts as “eight distinct, major voices in the chapter”: the sirens (Miss Douce and Miss Kennedy), Bloom, Pat the waiter, Simon Dedalus, Boylan, Lenehan, the blind tuner, and Ben Dollard. According to Andreas Fischer it appears that the result is neither a Fuga nor any other explicit musical form.269

269 Fischer (1990, 43) questions the musicality of the episode on the whole, apart from what he calls the “introduction”: “The result appears to be that it is neither a Fuga nor any other explicit musical form and that its most music-like part is the introduction, a kind of overture that introduces ‘themes’, that is words and fragments of sentences that will re-occur in their proper context later in the episode.”
As another macrostructural analogy, the first two pages of the episode have ever since Gilbert’s study been most often called an overture or a prelude, but according to Wolf (1999, 137), “on further reflection, ‘prelude’ seems to be somewhat misleading: the opening of ‘Sirens’ consists of a highly abbreviated sketch of the following pages, and this is a relation which is never found between a prelude and a fugue”. Johnson (1998, 875) suggests it resembles a quick flick through the score by the conductor before a performance.

These macrostructural analogies are virtually invisible in the translations, or rather possible differences in interpretation have had little effect on concrete translational choices. There is, however, a macrostructural analogy pertaining to the presupposed form of fuga per canonem, which a translator must consider in translating this intermedial source text: the polyphony of music, to which the signifiers of literature can only imply.²⁷⁰

I would suggest that Joyce seems aware of the need for polyphony in music and especially in a fugue, but in the ‘Sirens’ he has not been able to maintain polyphony throughout the episode (the simultaneously struck chords of multiple meaning in every word of Finnegans Wake may be a further development in this technique). Instead, he attempts to create an illusion of simultaneous voices by use of syntagmatic fragmented polyphony in parts of the episode. A syntagmatic, let us say, monologic polyphony can obviously never be polyphony in the true meaning of the word, but there certainly seems to be an attempt at such an imitation in the episode.

There is an example of Joyce’s technique at the very end of the episode, wherein four voices, plus Bloom’s natural wind instrument as fifth,²⁷¹ are tied together in fragmented polyphony:

```
Seabloom, greaseabloom viewed last words. Softly. When my country takes her place among.
Prrpr.
Must be the bur.
Ff! Oo. Rrpr.
Nations of the earth. No-one behind. She’s passed. Then and not till then.
```

²⁷⁰ See Fischer (1990, 40): “Language, then, is essentially monophonous, while music can be monophonous, homophonous or polyphonous.”

²⁷¹ Fischer (1990, 45) explicates: “It is thus only fitting that the episode which begins with a half-musical overture should end in the same fashion with the polyphony of Robert Emmet’s last words in Bloom’s interior monologue […], the noise of a passing tram and Bloom’s breaking wind.”
In this composition one may hear five interlaced voices: 1) narrative discourse, 2) Bloom’s inner monologue, 3) the last words of Robert Emmet, 4) the onomatopoeic noises of the tram, and 5) Bloom’s bodily functions. There are naturally differences in the translations’ onomatopoeic material due to different languages and choices of words around the onomatopoeia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

### Notes


There are two translational choices to consider pertaining to the polyphonic structural analogy. First are the translations of “softly”. It is surprising that all translators consider it to belong to the narrative discourse (“leppoisasti”, “sakta”), as opposed to Bloom’s inner monologue (‘be quiet!’ or ‘hush!’). It is perhaps even more surprising that both Swedish translators choose the equivalent “sakta” (‘slowly’), which must be considered a peripheral reading. Secondly, Saarikoski differs from the other translators in that he seems to interpret the last word of the episode to belong to Bloom’s inner monologue. Other translators tie it to Robert Emmet’s last words by use of italics. Andersson’s ‘talat’ would seem to be semantically the best translation.

As for microstructural analogies, Joyce’s ‘Sirens’ offers a veritable encyclopedia of examples. Riikonen lists at least trill, tremolo, staccato, martellato, and fermata. Let us consider here just a few. An example of staccato may be found in the middle of the episode, as Leopold Bloom decides to write a letter to Martha:

Bald deaf Pat brought quite flat pad ink Pat set with ink pen quite flat pad. Pat took plate dish knife fork. Pat went.


The staccato effect of the passage is achieved by monosyllabic words arranged in what would seem to lend itself to a trochaic rhythm. In my reading, the trochee is supported by the positioning of the proper nouns ‘Pat’, which are stressed on the third and ninth syllable, and so forth, and the ends of sentences which fall on unstressed syllables.

---


276 If we judge the likeliness of an interpretation by a method often used by translators, comparing the order of possible interpretations in a monolingual dictionary, this view is substantiated. For example, in Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary ‘slowly’ is meaning number 33 for ‘softly’.

277 “Seireenit-episodissa on mukana erittäin runsaasti kaikenlaisia musiikin muotoja ja teknisiä ratkaisuja [...] siinä ovat mukana mm. trillit, tremolo, staccato, martellato ja fermaatti” (Riikonen 1985, 85).
sixteen, twenty-two, and twenty-four. One would assume the Swedish translators would have an advantage in this respect due to the characteristically long words of the Finnish language. On the other hand, a trochee is a natural rhythm for Finnish.

Saarikoski starts off with a trochee and finds a substitute method of alluding to staccato: the repeated syllables of “litilitteän”. Furthermore, he successfully imitates the dominant ‘a’ phoneme of the original with abundant ‘i’ s. Lehto makes a drastic choice in following Joyce’s form: he shortens the Finnish words to first syllables only to maintain the staccato effect. He gives the key to reading the sentence in a footnote. He further notes that the sentence can be read “singing” two octaves up and one down.

278 In his article “Probably not a bit like it really”, the Turkish retranslator of Ulysses, Armağan Ekici, has discussed the rendering of “Bald Pat” in an agglutinating language: “In the second paragraph, trusting that the reader will remember what Pat was asked for, I replicated the effect, dispensed with grammar and used only words with one or two syllables: ‘Kel şâr Pat tut gel hokka pek düz käât’ (Bald deaf Pat hold come pot quite flat paper, T/Ekici 271), also contracting the two syllables of ‘kâût’ to the spoken ‘kâât’ (in effect one long syllable) to approximate the monosyllables” (Ekici 2020, 190).


281 TWO, 270: “Bald Pat came with pad flat and ink. Pat served pen to ink and pad flat. Pat picked plate dish knife fork. Pat went out.”

282 EAU, 278: “Bald deaf Pat brought quite plain blotter ink. Pat laid out ink pen quite plain blotter. Pat took plate platter knife fork. Pat went.”

283 We do not know how Joyce would have interpreted the acoustic, euphonic nature of his musicalized prose aloud. The only recording Joyce made from Ulysses was the November 1924 His Master’s Voice recording of the John F. Taylor speech from the ‘Aeolus’ episode. In the later, August 1929, recording of the passage from ‘Anna Livia Plurabelle’ of Finnegans Wake, there are hints of
Warburton’s translation sings perhaps the most ethnocentrically Swedish music, however Andersson does not seem to follow the source text’s form much closer. In Andersson there is a hint of favouring the ‘ä’ grapheme, as the original favoured ‘a’.

From a polyphonic point of view, it would seem, again, that the two Swedish translations of *Ulysses* are complementary, and the Finnish antithetical to one another. In addition, the Swedish translations would seem to be more independent, as the Finnish translations are interdependent. Lehto’s translation of ‘Sirens’ could hardly exist such as it is had it not been born in dialogue with Saarikoski’s translation. Lehto’s ‘Sirens’ translation could not have been the first Finnish translation of the episode. We could not have got as far as Lehto goes with his translation, without Saarikoski first bringing the episode into Finnish culture in a more readily acceptable form.

Another musical structure imitated in ‘Sirens’ is the fermata, or hold. It is an element of musical notation indicating that the note should be sustained for longer than its note value. The overly sustained last note of Simon Dedalus’ song is imitated by an equally protracted imaginary content analogy and finally a microstructural analogy to fermata:

> [...] high resplendent, aflame, crowned, high in the effulgence symbolistic, high, of the ethereal bosom, high, of the high vast irradiation everywhere all soaring all around about the all, the endlessnessnessness...

*JIU*, 226-7

The fermata is implied in two ways here: the sustained note is given an imaginary referent, which is prolonged out of proportion. Second, the final syllable of the last word of the sentence, ‘endlessness’, is left, as it were, ringing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[...] korkealla vältkehtivä, liekehtivä, kruunattu, korkealla symbolisessa loisteessa, korkealla, eteerisestä povesta, korkealla, korkeasta valtavasta säteilystä kaikkialla</td>
<td>[...] korkealla vältkehtien, liekeissä, kruunupääänä, korkealla loisteessa symbolistisessa, korkealla, eteerisen poven, korkealla, korkean valtavan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joyce following a musical, watery lilt of the river, as well as, apparently, the brogue of an Irish washerwoman. There are a number of English audio book editions of *Ulysses* and ‘Sirens’, among them the 2004 Naxos AudioBooks version read by Irish actor Jim Norton (with Marcella Riordan as Molly Bloom). In the ‘Sirens’, Norton does not sing this passage, nor does he emphasize the staccato aspect, but rather slowly and matter-of-factly trots through the sentence. Warburton’s, Saarikoski’s, or Lehto’s translations are not available as audio books, but Erik Andersson’s translation is, read by Swedish actor Reine Brynolfsson in 2013. Brynolfsson reads the passage pensively, musingly, not singing but certainly not as abrupt staccato.
Saarikoski and Andersson are able to reproduce the forms and rhythms of musicalized fiction to a certain extent. Warburton’s translation is rather a tremolo-sound within the word, and Lehto varies his fermata for one reason or another with ‘syys’, creating an unmotivated association of ‘autumn’. Once the fiction is estranged as in this case by its musicalization, a reader will grasp at straws to give the text meaning. In that case it would seem important that the translator abstains from adding new meanings where meaningless form is intended.

Tremolo is in music a trembling effect, a rapid reiteration of a note. The passage in which Mr Bloom’s thoughts meander to his wife Molly is often considered an example of this:

Big Spanishy eyes goggling at nothing. Her wavyavyeavyheavyeavyevyevyhair un comb : ‘d. 

If we follow Gilbert, this should rather be viewed as a trill, a musical ornament consisting of a rapid alternation between two adjacent notes – in this case ‘wavy’ and ‘heavy’. In fact, I would argue that the effect in all the translations is a glissando, a

---

284 PSO, 270: “[...] high glistening, flaming, crowned, high in symbolic glow, high, from the ethereal bosom, high, from a high immense radiance all around everything flies glides over everything, infinityityity…”

285 LLU, 315: “[...] high glimmering, aflame, crownheaded, high in glow symbolic, high, of the ethereal bosom, high, of high immense radiation everything rising everywhere over above everything endlessnesslessness…”

286 TWO, 267: “[...] high glimmering burning crowned, high in symbolic lustre, high out of ethereal bosom, high from the mighty light all around hovering all around everywhere, in endlesslessnessness.”

287 EAU, 275: “[...] highshining, flaming, crowned, high in symbolic radiance, high in the ethereal bosom, high in the high mighty radiance everywhere hovering all around everything over all, endlesslessnesslessnesslessness…”

288 See Riikonen (1985, 85): “tremolossa yleensä sanan tavut toistetaan”.

289 Gilbert (1955, 254) uses the Italian verb ‘trillando’ for the alternation of two musical tones a diatonic second apart: “[...] phrase here is a trillando, and the word uncombed is written exactly as a singer might have to enounce it at the close of a cadence.”

---
glide from one pitch to another. In the translations, this interpretation is implicit, except for Lehto, who explicitly mentions tremolo in his footnote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isot espanjalaiset silmät tyhjään tuijottavat. Hänen aaltoilelailleivailevainen tukkansa kampaamatta.</td>
<td>Isot espanjalaismait silmät ei-mihinkään mukkoivat. Henen hulmaululmualmualavaivaivaivaiset hiuksensa kampaamat: ’ta’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stora spanska ögon glor på ingenting. Hennes vågågågungungungunga hår okammat.</td>
<td>Stora spanska ögon som glor mot ingenting. Hennes vågigaågigaygigaygigaavgaavigahår o kamm: ’d’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we also have an excellent example of the form versus content challenge of translating musicalized prose. In addition to the form of either tremolo or trill, ‘wavyvayceavyheavyeavyeyevy’ also carries meaning. Saarikoski’s trill has no other sensible meaning than ‘wavy’. Lehto in fact has three, “hulmu” (‘wavy’), “almu” (‘alms’), and “vaivaiset” (‘measly’). Perhaps at least ‘measly’ should be considered a poor semantic equivalent for ‘wavy’ and ‘heavy’ hair. Warburton’s ‘wavy’ and ‘swinging’ seems a good fit. Andersson is in danger of over translating with ‘wavy’, ‘bushy’, ‘awkward’, and ‘everlasting’.

The analysis of the translations of imaginary content analogies and micro- and macrostructural analogies in the ‘Sirens’ episode would seem to support the view that the first translations by Warburton and Saarikoski tend to be more invisible and ethnocentric, and the retranslation by Andersson and Lehto more manifest and nonethnocentric. Andersson’s and especially Lehto’s retranslations challenge the translation pact by making their “translatedness” manifest by introducing more of the native strangeness of Joyce and the foreignness of the English word music into the target texts. The retranslators also interrupt the legato line of the fugue with more explicit imitations of the distinct musical structures. It is hard to say whether this is in

290 PSO, 272: “Large Spanish eyes staring idly. Her walyalywavy hair uncombed.”
291 LLU, 317: “Big Spanishy eyes no-where glared. Her wavyweaslyeaslymeasly hair uncomb: ’d.”
292 TWO, 269: “Great Spanish eyes staring at nothing. Her wavyavyavingsvavingswinging hair uncombed.”
293 EAU, 277: “Great Spanish eyes that stare towards nothing. Her wavyavybushyawkwardeternal hair un comb: d.”
the service of an overall sense of musicality, or whether the resulting affect is something different, more formal, and academic. It may be beneficial to keep in mind Stuart Gilbert’s precept for reading ‘Sirens’. It must not be read as a learned man listens to a fugue – too analytically, and not as a whole:

He who reads such passages as certain cultured concert-goers prefer to hear a fugue – with the parts kept mentally distinct in four, or less, independent horizontal lines of melody – will miss much of the curious emotive quality of Joyce’s prose in this episode.

Gilbert 1955, 252

Does the text lose something when its formal aspects are foregrounded? If it does not lose – as Gilbert suggests – much of its emotive quality, it will certainly lose some of the magical nature or, as Bloom would put it, the music loses its charms. In a more analytical translation, Joyce’s prose is in danger of losing its subversive, ambivalent quality, as it is made more regular, more *per canonem*.

Finally, we come to the last form of implicit imitation: word music. The term ‘word music’ was coined by Scher (1970, 152), and according to Wolf (1999, 58) it “refers to a musicalizing technique which exploits the basic similarity between verbal and musical signifiers”. The two agree that word music aims at poetic imitation of musical sound and gives the impression of a presence of music by foregrounding the acoustic dimensions of the verbal signifiers. Word music may be manifested in fiction by emphasized use of pitch, timbre, rhythm, harmonies, verbal recurrences, and of course onomatopoeia.

Early in the episode, when miss Douce threatens a young barboy, the ‘unmannerly boots’, there is an example of reduction of words into rhythmically repeated syllabic units:

—I’ll complain to Mrs de Massey on you if I hear any more of your impertinent insolence.
—Imperthnthn thnthnthn, bootssnout sniffed rudely, as he retreated as she threatened as he had come.

JJU, 212

The bootssnout’s reply is of course onomatopoeic association motivated by miss Douce’s comment, as probably his own words fail him, but there is a hint of an
expressive locution in his sniffle. The intended perlocutionary effect might be, for example, a rude vocal gesture to disarm the preceding threat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– Minä valitan rouva de Masseyle jos minä enää yhtään kuulen noita sinun nenäkkäitä röyhkeyksiä.</td>
<td>– Valitan vielä rva de Masseylle jos vielä kuulen noita sinun hävyttömiä tuhmuksiasi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Nennännii röyrhörröeh, palveluskärsä pyrskyti karkeasti kun hän peräytyi kun häntä uhattiin kun hän oli tullut.294</td>
<td>– Hävyththnln thththhnm,2 lankkinenä tuhisi tylstki kun vetäytyi kun hen uhkaili kuten hän oli tullut.295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– Jag kommer att klaga hos mrs de Massey om du inte slutar med din näsvisa oförsökämndhet.</td>
<td>– Jag ska säga till mrs de Massey om jag får höra flera sådana oförsökämnda kommentarer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Näsvicha schaschaschascha, fnös skoputstrynet när han motades hotades ut.296</td>
<td>– Oföhndhnd hndnhndn, snorkade sjasen nosigt medan han motades och hotades samma väg han kommit.297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each translation the ‘sniffle’ of the ‘bootssnout’ is tied to the threat (‘impertinent insolence’) of miss Douce. In Saarikoski’s translation the threat of “röyhkeyksiä” (‘impudence’) creates an association of the Finnish imitation of the ‘oink’ of a pig, “röh”. This also re-creates the perlocution of a rude and insolent answer to a threat. If we were to see the desired effect of the ‘sniffle’ to be to quiet down the other speaker, then the voiceless sibilant consonants of the other three translators would be most appropriate. Warburton has the accusation of “Näsvicha” (‘saucy’) turning into sibilant sounds “schascha”, while it is harder for me to imagine how Andersson’s “oförsökämnda” (‘shameless’) turning into “Oföhndhnd hndnhndn” would be said aloud. Lehto’s translation follows the written form of the source text most closely.

294 PSO, 252: “- I will complain to missis de Massey if I hear any more of those your cheeky impudences. / - Cheekychee impudoinkoink, servantsnout spittled roughly as he backed away as he was threatened as he had come.”
295 LLU, 296: “- I’ll soon complain to Mrs. de Massey[footnote] if I still hear those scurrilous naughtinesses of yours. / - Scurthnth nthghtght[footnote], shoepolishnose snuffled rudely when he retreated when she threatened as he had come.”
296 TWO, 250: “- I’m going to complain to Mrs de Massey if you don’t stop with your saucy insolence. / - Sauschy schyschyschyschyschy, snorted shoeshinesnout when he headed threatened out.”
297 EAU, 257-7: “- I will tell Mrs de Massey if I hear more of such shameless comments. / - Shamhndhnd hndnhndn, sniffled errandboy scurrilously while he retreated and threatened the same way he had come.”
Joyce’s word music is based on rhythmic repetition. The sound ‘thn’ is repeated five times. Warburton’s Swedish translation conveys five identical repetitions of the sound ‘sha’, although the sound itself with the open back vocal ‘a’ is phonetically quite far from Joyce’s combination of consonants. Andersson’s word music is close to repetition but varies with ‘hind’ and ‘hndn’, quite similarly to Lehto. Saarikoski’s word music displays most variation.

In the next example the irreferrential word music may ambivalently contain denotative meaning:

O, look we are so! Chamber music. Could make a kind of pun on that. It is a kind of music I often thought when she. Acoustics that is. Tinkling. Empty vessels make most noise. Because the acoustics, the resonance changes according as the weight of the water is equal to the law of falling water. Like those rhapsodies of Liszt’s, Hungarian, gipsyeyed. Pearls. Drops. Rain. Dididdledidle addleaddle oodleoodle. Hisss. Now. Maybe now. Before.

First of all, there is a self-referential intertextual allusion to Joyce’s own first publication of poetry: *Chamber Music* (1907). One might argue the translations do not convey the pun of ‘chamber pot’, to which also the word music of “diddleiddle” refers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oi, katsokaa me olemme niin!</td>
<td>Oi, katsokaa me ollaan niin!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Chamber music: Joycen runokokoelma. Chamber pot: “yöastia”, “potta”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

298 PSO, 277: “Oh, look we are so! Chamber music. Could make a kind of pun on that. It is the kind of music that I often think when she. Acoustics it is. Tinkle. Empty barrels rattle the most. Since acoustics, resonance will change according to the weight of water is equal to the law of falling water. Like those Liszt’s Hungarian rhapsodies, gipsyeyed. Beads. Drops. Rain! Didid idl adl udl udl. Hss. Now. Maybe now. Sooner.”

299 LLU, 322: “Oh, look we is so! Chamber music: sleeping chamber. You could get a kind of pun of that. [footnote] Precisely the kind of music I often thought of when she. Acoustics it is. Patter. Empty barrels babble most. Because acoustics, the resonance will change accordingly as the weight of water is equal to the law of falling water. Like those Liszt’s rhapsodies, Hungarian, gipsyeyed. Beads. Drops. Rain! Diddledidl dodledodl uuddleuuudle. Hi-s-s-s-is [footnote]. Now. Maybe now. Before.”
On the other hand, it is debatable whether the title of Chamber Music did refer to ‘chamber pot’. Joyce made the jocund connection only later on. The original reference of “Chamber music” is music, which is in fact in keeping with the classical rhythmical content of the collection. What follows is that this metatextual reference is quite ambiguous. Of the translators, Lehto is able to remedy the loss of allusion in a footnote, but, on the other hand, limits the ambivalence of interpretation.

There is an ambivalence of denotative meaning and acoustic, bodily reference in the word music of “Hissss”. Warburton interprets a denotative reference to ‘silent’ or ‘silence’, whereas Saarikoski and Andersson convey ‘hissing’, the onomatopoetic reference to the sound in the chamber pot. Lehto sees a denotative reference to ‘him’, presumably Blazes Boylan, and departs from Joyce’s form toward a presumed content.

In the episode, phonetic repetition and mutation is a method of creating new meaning:

All flushed (O!), panting, sweating (O!), all breathless.
Married to Bloom, to greaseabloom.
—O saints above! miss Douce said, sighed above her jumping rose.

JJU, 214

---

300 TWO, 273: “Oh, see what we are! Chamber music. Could do a kind of pun on that. It is a kind of music I often thought when she. It’s acoustics. Dripping. Empty barrels make the most noise. For the acoustics, the resonance is changed in accordance with the weight of the water is equal to the law of falling water. Like those rhapsodies of Liszt, Hungarian, romanieyed. Pearls. Drops. Rain. Fiddel iddel addel diddel diddel. Silent. Now. Maybe now. Before.”

301 EAU, 281: “O! are we not! Chamber music. Could do a sort of joke out of it. It is a kind of music I often thought when she. Acoustics that is. Tinkled. Empty drums rattle the most. Because of the acoustics, the sound changes as the weight of water corresponding to the law of falling water. Like those rhapsodies of Liszt, Hungarian, gipsyeyed. Pearls. Drops. Rain. Dippelippe ippelappe oppeloppe. Hissses. Now. Maybe now. Earlier.”
How does greasy nose and goggle eyes relate to Bloom? The ‘greasy nose’ and ‘goggle
eye’ are originally epithets given by misses Douce and Kennedy for the ‘fogey in
Boyd’s’, apparently a pharmacist. Zimmerman (2002, 115) suggests a harmony
between Bloom’s answer-part in the fugue, and the sirens’ countersubject which occur
simultaneously earlier in the episode: “Here the sirens and Bloom are in free
counterpoint with each other. If this were a sounded piece of music, the sirens’ line –
‘Married to Bloom, to greaseabloom’ (l. 180) – would sound simultaneously with
Bloom’s voice – ‘Greaseabloom’ (l. 185).” In any case the result is that the ‘fogey’s’
epithets stick to ‘greaseabloom’ and begin to describe him in the world of the
narrative. There is obvious referential content: at least ‘grease’ and ‘sea’ (perhaps also
‘case’), yet the word agglutination seems motivated by phonology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aivan palavissaan (oo!), läähättäen, hikoillen (oo!), aivan hengästyksissään.</td>
<td>Palavissaan (oo!), läähättäen, hikoillen (oo!), hengästyksissään.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naimisissa Bloomin, ihratahratihrubloomin kanssa.</td>
<td>Avioissa Bloomin, talihalialibloomin’ kanssa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Voi veljet! neiti Douce sanoi, huokasi hypähtävän ruusunsä yllä. 302</td>
<td>– Oi hyvä Pyhät! nti Douce sanoi, huooten hypähtelevän ruusunsä yllä. 303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARBURTON</th>
<th>ANDERSSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodnande (O!), flämtande, svettiga (O!), tappade andan. Gift med Bloom, med flottlottbloom.</td>
<td>Högröda (Å!), flämtande, svettiga (Å!), alldes andrutna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Å, alla helgon! suckade Douce över sin dansande ros. 304</td>
<td>Gift med Bloom, med oljeblom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Å du helige! sade miss Douce och suckade ovanför sin hävande ros. 305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Warburton conveys “flott” (‘grease’), varies with “lott”, with the possible meaning of
‘part’ or ‘share’. The ‘fogey’s’ epithets earlier in Warburton were ‘glosöga’ and ‘flottiga
nosen’. Saarikoski makes Joyce’s form less foreign for his readers, beginning with
“ihra” (‘grease’), and making his own associations: ‘stain’ and ‘squinty’. Of the

302 PSO, 254-5: “Quite burning up (oo!), panting, sweating (oo!), quite out of breath. / Married to Bloom, fat stain squintybloom. / - Oh brother! Miss Douce said, sighed above her jumping rose.”
303 LLU, 298: “Burning up (oo!), panting, sweating (oo!), out of breath. / Wedded to Bloom, to tallow hug belowbloom[footnote]. / - Oh, good Saints! Miss Douce said, sighing above her jumping rose.”
304 TWO, 252: “Blushing (O!), panting, sweating (O!), lost for breath. Married to Bloom, the grease lot bloom. / - Oh, all saints! Douce sighed over her dancing rose.”
305 EAU, 260: “Bright red (Oh!), panting, sweaty (Oh!), all out of breath. / Married to Bloom, with oil bloom. / - Oh thou holy! Miss Douce said and sighed above her heaving rose.”
retranslators, Andersson has only ‘oil’ here, while Lehto has ‘tallow’, ‘hug’, and ‘below’, and naturally a footnote to explicate.

In the episode, vocal forms of words create new referential associations. In the following passage, Bloom is crossing Essex bridge, thinking about his correspondence with Martha:


In the focalized consciousness of Mr Bloom the ‘yes’ and ‘Essex’ morph into “Yessex”. This motivates a thought of Martha, “Buy paper”. This further associates to ‘loneliness’ and to what Fischer (1990, 46) calls the Bloom leitmotif: “Blue bloom is on the rye.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAARIKOSKI</th>
<th>LEHTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WARBURTON</td>
<td>ANDERSSON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Warburton combines ‘ja’ with ‘Essex’ with the adequate distortion to ‘Jassex’. Later on, the Swedish language lends itself to the fairly literal and formally equivalent translation of “Blå blom över rågen”. However, Andersson’s play on the written form of ‘SX-bron’ is a very clever way to allude to where Mr Bloom’s train of thought is headed. His retranslation also takes advantage of the near homonymy of ‘blå blom’.

In Saarikoski “ylitti” (‘walked over’) leads to “Ylissex” (‘Oversex’), which seems laboured. In the leitmotif Saarikoski sacrifices the form for referential content. Lehto has the regular spoken language form of “kyllä” for ‘yes’ earlier in the sentence, but then substitutes it with the colloquial ‘jees’ to form “Jees-seksi”, which is also quite an estranging translation. In the leitmotif Lehto trusts a modern Finnish reader to read ‘blüm’, and not, as in Finnish ‘blöm’, and then associates with ‘u’: ‘flower’ and ‘wretch’, and finally the distortion ‘bluu moon’.

6.3. The grain of the voice

In Franz Kafka’s short story “The Silence of the Sirens”, published seven years after his death in 1924, the story of brave Odysseus and the Sirens is re-told. In Kafka’s telling of the story, Odysseus is so enchanted by his safety measures – the wax and the bonds – that he fails to notice the Sirens are in fact not singing at all. It is the silence of the Sirens, the voiceless song, that Odysseus, according to Kafka, does not hear. Kafka’s Odysseus sees the Siren’s opened mouths and extended necks, and assumes he is protected from their song; he hears a voiceless song sung from within. Similarly, it would almost seem possible for the reader of Joyce’s ‘Sirens’, and perhaps especially for a scholar, to arm himself with the Gilbert schema, and musical metaphors and structures, and read music into the fiction of the episode, never noticing the text is in fact not music, but fiction all along.

Reading ‘Sirens’ for the first time, a reader does not first notice the music in the text. What the reader is first subjected to is the realization that the conventional reading strategies of fiction are not entirely sufficient. The text is odd, an explanation is required. The essential effect of musicalization of fiction is the inherent “strangeness”
and it must be considered that Joyce, in his modernist, experimental ethos, was more interested in the possibilities of freeing his prose from the necessities of referentiality than exploring the possibilities of referentiality for music.

For Julia Kristeva\textsuperscript{300} this referentiality, or formal signification – denotation – is tied to the \textit{symbolic} aspect of language, and she names it \textit{phenotext}. The unfaltering denotation of the phenotext acts to protect laws and rules of language, of identification, subjectivity, and ultimately the bourgeois system. Unfaltering signification writes unfaltering world order, and in his subversive style, Joyce is clearly attempting to shake this kind of symbolic system of fiction in his ‘Sirens’. According to Kristeva, the other aspect of language is the \textit{semiotic}, and she names this \textit{genotext}. For Kristeva, this poetic language refers to the primary, bodily, semiotic significance of language, and constantly acts to subvert the symbolic meaning of the phenotext. The genotext originates in the semiotic mode that precedes the dichotomies of subject and object, and signifier and signified. The musicality of Joyce’s fiction in the ‘Sirens’ could certainly be seen to act as a primal genotext attempting to break the symbolic surface of the fictive phenotext.

In his essay “The Grain of the Voice” \textit{(Le grain de la voix, 1972)}, Roland Barthes transposes Kristeva’s phenotext and genotext into his discussion of listening to music, specifically the two male voices of Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau and Charles Panzéra. For Barthes, the German lyric baritone Fischer-Dieskau represents \textit{pheno-song}, a denotative, communicative and petit-bourgeoisie mode of singing:

“\textit{E}verything which, in the performance, is at the service of communication, of representation, of expression: what is usually spoken of, what forms the tissue of cultural values” (Barthes 1985, 270). Pheno-song communicates a meaning that is symbolically received by its audience and causes pleasure (\textit{plaisir}). In pheno-song the denotative meaning and the emotive content of the piece of music is highlighted and explicated.

In Barthes’ essay, his ideal mode of singing – the \textit{geno-song} – is represented by the baritone voice of the Swiss operatic singer Charles Panzéra, a representative of the French (Paris Conservatory) school of singing. Panzéra does not stop to denote,

\textsuperscript{300} On the strange music of the “Sirens”, see Fischer (1990, 42): “If music cannot become language, can language become music? […] “[I]n an attempt to become music language will break some of its conventions, will disrupt some of its norms, will – in short – become strange.”

explicate, communicate or, according to Barthes, even breathe, but his singing flows in an uninterrupted legato line. To Barthes (1985, 271), the geno-song is “a signifying function alien to communication, to representation (of feelings), to expression; it is that culmination (or depth) of production where melody actually works on language – not what it says but the voluptuous pleasure of its signifier-sounds”.

In her book on Kristeva, Barthes, and the performance of music, literature and music scholar Laura Wahlfors (2013, 61) notes that geno-song, just like Kristeva’s genotext, can only be described through pheno-song, as the negation of communication and representation. The sensual materiality of language is essential to the vocal significance (as opposed to significance) of geno-song (ibid., 67). This is the “grain of the voice” (grain de la voix) of Barthes’ title, the friction between sound and language: “[T]he grain of the voice, when the voice is in a double posture, a double production: of language and of music” (Barthes 1985, 269).

In Homer’s Odyssey the Sirens’ song is depicted in just eight lines, and it may well be asked if the Sirens sing at all. It is the hearing of their voice that, according to Homer, beguiles seafarers, but do we hear them singing? All that is heard of the Siren-song in Homer is eight lines of direct speech or song.312 Circe warns Odysseus of the Sirens’ “clear-toned song” (l. 44), but according to Odysseus himself the Sirens “spoke, sending forth their beautiful voice” (l. 193). In Homer the Sirens’ song is language, but language performed in a beautiful (musical?) voice. This is very much grain de la voix, friction between sound and language. In the Siren song there is both symbolic meaning, the denotation of the pheno-song “come hither”, but also the semiotic meaning, the luring way in which they say or sing it, the geno-song which refers and affects Odysseus’ body directly, so much so that he would forget and abandon the laws of society, family, hierarchy, if he were not actually, physically tied to them with bonds.

For Roland Barthes, the referent of music is the body. As Wahlfors (2013, 227) notes, Barthes sees possibilities of narrativity everywhere, but strikingly, not in music. Specifically, as Barthes concludes in his 1975 essay on the romantic piano compositions of Robert Schumann, music is not a system of signifiers and signifieds.

312 “δεῦρ᾽ ἄγ᾽ ἰών, πολύαιν᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ, μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαϊῶν[…]” (‘Come hither, as thou farest, renowned Odysseus, great glory of the Achaeans[…]’), English translation by A. T. Murray, 12.184-191).
Music has but one referent: “[I]n music, a field of signifying and not a system of signs, the referent is unforgettable, for here the referent is the body” (Barthes 1985, 308). A writer is always condemned to meaning, whereas music is only signifiers referring, without relay, to the body. In Barthes’ view, music exceeds the boundaries of language and representation. Barthes, an amateur musician but a professional writer, focuses on how music may liberate language from the burden of signification. In “The Pleasure of the Text” (Le Plaisir du texte, 1973) Barthes considers writing for the ear, the aural aspect of language so central to Joyce’s literary work, l’écriture à haute voix:

Writing aloud is not expressive; it leaves expression to the pheno-text, to the regular code of communication; it belongs to the geno-text, to significance; it is carried not by dramatic inflections, subtle stresses, sympathetic accents, but by the grain of the voice, which is an erotic mixture of umbre and language [...] its aim is not the clarity of message, the theatre of emotions; what it searches for [...] are pulsional incidents, the language lined with flesh.

Barthes 1990, 66

There clearly is a grain, friction, also in the fiction of Joyce. Even before we answer the question how the Sirens sing, or how does Joyce make his fiction musical, there clearly is friction, the strangeness that begs the question. In “The Grain of the Voice” Barthes is considering the performance of music, not the composition of music. Here I come to the question of translation. What is the performance of the Finnish and Swedish translators of the ‘Sirens’ of Joyce’s musicalized prose: do they stop to explicate the symbolic in the mode of pheno-song, or do they refer to the semiotic in the legato line of geno-song? Are they able to include both and re-create the grain de la voix?

The grain can be seen in the very metaphor Joyce chose as the “musical form” of the episode: fuga per canonem. A ‘canon’ may refer to a contrapuntal composition using a texture of repetitions and imitations, a polyphonic structure. This polyphony, with its de-centralization of narrativity and subjectivity, sounds decidedly semiotic, and therefore would foreground geno-song. A ‘canon’ may, however, also refer to rule, as in “fugue according to rule”: the very constricted form of the academic fugue. In this sense a canon would be in service of rule, law, and identity – the symbolic of the pheno-song. According to Wahlfors (2013, 364) a ‘fugue’ is for Kristeva the kind of polyphony that frees or deconstructs subjectivity into inter-subjectivity. Like polyphonic music, the fugue offers a metaphoric alternative to the monotonous signification of predicative language. However, a fuga is not, as Wahlfors (2013, 368)
demonstrates, opposed to formality or rationality: for example, for J. S. Bach it was a form that represented the rational composition of the cosmos.

In this chapter, I have attempted to answer the question how the sirens sing, and how the imitation of music has been imitated in translations and retranslations into Finnish and Swedish. I have taken an intermedial approach to Joyce’s ‘Sirens’ and proposed that the musical effect of the episode, the musicalization of the fiction, can be felt in the allusions to songs and song lyrics, and possible imitations of musical forms and ornaments, but mostly by the foregrounding of the aural and acoustic nature of language – word music. The symbolic references to specific musical pieces, forms and effects are compositional crutches upon which a piece of living (musicalized) prose is composed, and I have compared the effect of emphasizing those braces and structures in the performance of the translation of the piece with the effect of allowing the piece to flow uninterrupted.

I have discussed these three types of musicalization following Werner Wolf’s typology suggested in The Musicalization of Fiction. In the typology, the areas of musical presence in literature are named thematization (or telling), evocation (or quotation), and imitation (or showing). Even though Wolf is in constant danger of losing the essence of music through his typological fervour, his formulation has served as a helpful way to categorize musicalizing techniques.

The thematization of music, those numerous cases in the ‘Sirens’ when music is the topic of conversation or narration, were divided, using Wolf’s typology, into intratextual, paratextual, and contextual thematization. I noted that the first translations, published in the 1940s and 60s, had less contextual sources such as research literature and reading companions surrounding their reception, highlighting the musical hypotext of the episode. This contextual reality leads to the first translators, Warburton and Saarikoski, to sing the Joyce composition in an uninterrupted legato line. The lack of research and contextual conversation will have affected the translations in two ways. First, as all the musical references and formulas of the text were not extensively researched, it would not have been possible for the translators to explicitly refer to all of them. Second, as the target text audiences had less contextual and paratextual knowledge of the specific referents, stopping to convey all the formal complexities would have resulted in unnecessary strangeness. The
retranslations, both published in 2012, rely on a better conceptual knowledge in their target audiences, to the extent that it would be hard for a modern audience not to read the episode as musicalized fiction. I also noted that in Lehto’s translation the contextual thematization of the source text enters the paratext of the translation target text through chapter titles and footnotes referring to research literature on musical connections. This certainly emphasizes the *fugue according to rule* aspect of the text and can be seen as a pheno-song rendition of Joyce’s musical fiction.

The second main area of musical presence in fiction, in Wolf’s typology, the evocation of music through associative quotation of song lyrics, is from a translator’s perspective related to the thematization of music. Also in this case the main question is the competence of the source text audience and the target text audience: how many of the allusions and quotations in his text did Joyce expect his target audience to recognize, and how many of them can a translator expect the target audience of his translated text to recognize, or even notice. The logic of evocative quotation is this: one of the media in an overtly intermedial artefact – the lyrics of a song – is quoted as such, and therefore the other media – the melody – is evoked, and the text becomes musical. The words of the song cause the melody of the song to start playing in the reader’s mind. If the song quoted is not recognized by the reader (of the translation), even an explanation or a paratextual clue informing her of the referent cannot evoke the music in her mind, and thus the quotation does not make the fiction musical.

Of the translators, Lehto is able to show Joyce’s references in the paratext – the footnotes of his translation but, as said, this does not imply musicalization of the text. In fact, the strangeness and foreignness of the translation the paratexts allow – the fact that due to the information Lehto adds in his footnotes, he is able to include more foreign and formal aspects of Joyce’s English word music in his translation – stops the musical legato of the fiction, and highlights the formal pheno-song of the episode. The first, introductory translations of Warburton and Saarikoski play their own Swedish and Finnish music, flowing uninterrupted, although departing from Joyce’s source-text form. Andersson’s Swedish retranslation is a mixture of the two approaches, showing evidence of an ethnocentric project – making Joyce sound like a Swedish-speaking contemporary – but relying on more conceptual knowledge on the part of his target audience.
I argued that even though thematization and evocation represent musical presence in fiction, they are not enough to constitute musicalization of fiction. The most strange and innovative musicalization of fiction in the ‘Sirens’ involves imitations of musical forms and ornaments, and the foregrounding of the aural and acoustic nature of language - word music. In familiar fiction we unintelligently hear, as Barthes describes in his 1976 essay “Listen” (Écoute), the familiar ambient noise of the phonic space. I suggest that the breaking points in which the genotext of music breaks through the phenotext of the fiction, alert the readers to listen: “It is against the auditive background that listening occurs, as if it were the exercise of a function of intelligence, i.e., of selection” (Barthes 1985, 247). The ‘Sirens’ force us to listen to fiction in a new way, to listen to the language in the aural form it shares with noise and music, and this Joyce achieves first and foremost through the techniques of imitations of the structures of music, and imitations of musical sound through word music.

Translating the grain of Joyce’s voice, the friction between language system and corporeal voice in his fiction, the translators are in a situation reminiscent of that of a translator of lyrical poetry. As it is the untranslatable of poetry, its non-expressive, poetic qualities that make poetry worth translating both for the source text and the target language to go beyond themselves, it is the untranslatable in musicalized fiction, the bodily and semiotic of the genosong that makes musicalized fiction necessary to translate in its strangeness and foreignness.

In Wolf’s typology, the mode of imitation, or ‘showing’, is divided again into three techniques: imaginary content analogies, structural analogies, and word music. Imaginary content analogy is a technique which gives music what Barthes could not imagine it having; narrativity - or a denotative meaning. An imaginary content analogy can refer to a real or imagined composition, and as it is imagined, it is subjective to the narrator or the focalized character in whose inner monologue the analogy appears. Therefore, this technique of musicalization proved ambiguous for the translators to interpret, and produced different translatorial reproductions.

Structural analogies are a technique in ‘Sirens’ which has been widely researched, from the macro-structure of the fugue form to the micro-structures of passages which are assumed to contain references to musical ornaments such as staccato, fermata, or tremolo. I found a polyphonic dialogue between the first translators and the retranslators in each language. The Swedish translators, Warburton
and Andersson, are not so polarized in their interpretations, and therefore both translations work individually. The Finnish translations are more interdependent. Saarikoski’s invisible and ethnocentric translation introduces Joyce’s musicalized fiction into the Finnish literary horizon, but “plays its own tune” to such an extent that Lehto’s formal retranslation was required to reopen the access to the work in its foreignness. On the other hand, Lehto’s translation could not exist in its foreignness and strangeness without the introduction of the work into Finnish in a more acceptable form by Saarikoski.

Word music is, in Wolf’s typology, implicit imitation which exploits the basic similarity between verbal and musical signifiers. In Barthesian terms, it is *significance* without symbolic reference to the signified (but a direct reference to the body). In this mode the trouble of the *grain*, the friction between irreferentiality and referentiality becomes apparent, as no word music in the ‘Sirens’ is without a hint of meaning. Therefore, a translator following Joyce’s form is in danger of losing the meaning, and a translator emphasizing the meaning is in danger of missing the music. The ambivalence of the pheno-song and the geno-song force the translators to play their own music, at times with the joy of interpretation, at times in a laboured tone.

In considering the special case of the listening of the psychoanalyst in “Listen”, Roland Barthes sees the myth of Odysseus and the Sirens to represent two ways of approaching the dangerous business of listening to the siren call of music:

> The myth of Ulysses and the sirens does not tell us what a successful listening might be; we can sketch it *a contrario* between the reeds the navigator-psychoanalyst must avoid at all costs: plugging one’s ears like the men of the crew, employing deception and giving evidence of cowardice like Ulysses, or answering the sirens’ invitation and vanishing.  
> Barthes 1985, 257

The subversive power of music is a danger to the narrativity of fiction, and the interpretations of the translators reflect the ambivalence built into the fabric of the

---

313 In *The Experience of the Foreign*, Berman (1992, 176) discusses the great German retranslations of the 20th century as reopening the access to the works from the classicist or Romantic horizons that earlier translations were tied to: “But retranslation in the twentieth century has a more specific historical and cultural meaning: to reopen the access to works whose unsettling and questioning power ended up being threatened at once by their ‘glory’ (too much clarity obscures, too great radiance exhausts) and by translations belonging to a phase of Western conscience that is no longer ours.” What Berman is saying here, I think, is that the relationship to the source text is not dependent on the order of first translations and retranslations, as is assumed in the retranslation hypothesis, but the literary and aesthetic horizons of the age of the original and translation.
composition. Joyce’s ‘Sirens’ must not be reduced to symbolic denotation, but the
musical aspect of the episode must also not be emphasized in an overly analytic,
formal way. There should be room for the ambivalence; the musicalized fiction needs
to be able to flow in a legato-line of the geno-song. We need to hear the grain of fictive
language against the musical voice.

In ‘Sirens’, Joyce plays music, in the joyous, ambivalent meaning of playing. In
Barthesian terms Joyce is struggling free from the paradigmatic structure of language
with its différence, denotation, and law, and attempts to supersede it with a lighter
difference, a nuance or Neutre. For Barthes, the Neutre is a moiré, a shimmering
pattern or fabric, constructed of subtle nuances. In this sense the polyphony of the
individual interpretations of the Finnish and Swedish translators, the macro-text of the
interactions of the polyphonic translation they constitute, is the ambivalent, nuanced
fabric of ‘Sirens’, changing its form with each re-reading and re-writing.
"The phenomenon which has been denominated"

Conclusions

In James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, ‘phenomenon’ is a word favoured by Leopold Bloom. It occurs in the book 21 times: four times in the direct narration of, or free indirect discourse focalized by, Bloom, six times in the ‘Cyclops’ narration parodying Bloom (from whence we learn that ‘phenomenon’ is a term associated with Bloom’s discourse by his Dublin compatriots), once in a parody of a medical conference interrupting the narration of ‘Cyclops’ (elaborating on the previous, intradiegetic parody), and nine times in a pastiche (once of Sir Thomas Browne’s *Religio Medici*, three times imitating John Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, and five occurrences in the pastiche of Catechism in chapter 17, ‘Ithaca’). Only one occurrence is in an episode focalized by Stephen Dedalus, and voiced by the “quaker librarian”, Thomas William Lyster, in chapter 9, ‘Scylla and Charybdis’.

Occurrences of ‘phenomenon’ are also very episode-specific: It occurs once in ‘Scylla and Charybdis’, eight times in ‘Cyclops’, four times in ‘Oxen of the Sun’, twice in ‘Circe’, once in ‘Eumaeus’, and five times in ‘Ithaca’. In general, ‘phenomenon’ is in *Ulysses* a word associated with feigned, unnatural, parodying, or imitating speech. It is a word that becomes emblematic of the difference of Leopold Bloom’s discourse to that of his fellow Dubliners.

A phenomenon is an observable fact or event, and for Leopold Bloom it is clearly a convincing, “scientific” word, applicable when he does not quite have the capacity to explain an object or aspect in great detail. ‘Phenomenon’ shares a common Greek root *phainein* (“to show”) with words like ‘epiphany’ and ‘fancy’. A ‘phenomenon’ (Greek *phainomenon*) is an object perceived through sensory experience, as distinguished from a *noumenon*. In episode 14, ‘Oxen of the Sun’, ‘Phenomenon’ takes the place of God in a world without God. In Swedish the
equivalent ‘fenomen’ shares common etymology with the English, the Finnish ‘ilmiö’ is a neologism from the 19th century, with a connotation of something that is apparent.

All the four Finnish and Swedish translators of *Ulysses* translate ‘phenomenon’ as “fenomen” (with the possible definite variant “fenomenen” or the composite “naturfenomen”, ‘natural phenomenon’) and ‘ilmiö’ (with its agglutinative inflection forms and possible composite noun forms) in all the 21 cases. As the word ‘hubbub’ in the title of this dissertation stands for, as suggested in the introduction and chapter 2 on the Polyphonic Translation Model, the confused, antagonistic or collaborative voices of the hypertext, hypotexts, source text, and target texts, the word ‘phenomenon’ stands metonymically for the phenomena of translation, retranslation, intertextuality, imitation, and parody.

Throughout the preceding six chapters, I have analysed the hubbub of layered voices of the phenomena of translation and intertextuality. I have studied, on the one hand, translation as an intertextual phenomenon: translations and retranslations are creative imitations and rewritings of a source text, and those texts the source text alludes to. On the other hand, I have explored what the praxis of translation exposes about the phenomena of intertextuality. To that end, I have limited my research to three specific intertextual practices, and three episodes in which they abound: translations of parody in ‘Cyclops’, translations of pastiche in ‘Oxen of the Sun’, and translations of musicalized fiction in ‘Sirens’. In the analysis of the manifestation of these three forms of intertextuality and intermediality in translated literature, it has become clear that the central dynamic of the study of the intertextual translations of *Ulysses*, and the translations of *Ulysses* as a thoroughly intertextual book remain: *Ulysses*, as a novel about writing and text, and styles and voices, is a work which should be impossible to translate, but also one which needs to be translated, reinterpreted, and re-created time and again.

In this thesis I have defined an intertextual and polyphonic view for the comparative study of (re)translated literature. This Polyphonic Translation Model studies the existence and becoming of intertextually complex literary works, such as *Ulysses*, within a literary horizon of, in this case its Finnish and Swedish translations, and sees (re)translations as hermeneutic comments in a system of rereading and rewriting. In chapter 2, “Never know whose thoughts you’re chewing”, I discussed my model as a Bakhtinian polyphonic model, a Kristevan intertextual model, and
Bermanian retranslation model. The general conclusion was that the PTM has explanatory force in the area of the afterlife of literature in (re)translation, since the polyphonic stance takes into account both the polyphonic context in which the translator (just like any reader) creates a new and unique interpretation of the source text according to his or her cultural background and aesthetics, and the polyphonic context in which the translator re-creates the target text for her audience, depending on the literary horizon, the ongoing cultural conversation in that target context.

In chapter 3, “Modulations of voice and translation of texts”, following Antoine Berman’s method of productive translation criticism, I introduced the Finnish and Swedish (re)translations of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, and made a preliminary critical examination of their respective translating positions, translation projects, and horizons of the translators. The translating position is a term by which Berman calls the composite of the driving force for the translation, and the translators’ view of their position in the field of literature. Thomas Warburton was a young poet with a special interest in English modernism, who offered himself for the publishing house as the Swedish translator of *Ulysses*. Pentti Saarikoski was a Finnish modernist poet, who answered a social command in the Finnish literary horizon for translations of the works of the great modernists. Erik Andersson is an experienced translator and writer, who undertook the project of the Swedish retranslation of *Ulysses* on the publishing house’s behest, with no explicated translation project, and Leevi Lehto was poet associated with sound poetry, who began his project with the musical ‘Sirens’ chapter, attempting to make his translation as different as possible from the first Finnish translator Saarikoski.

By the translation project Berman means the composite of the translating position and the translation task at hand. What does the translator want to accomplish with the translation, and what kind of a translation is called for by the publisher, editor, and other agents involved with the process? Both the first translations by Saarikoski and Warburton shared an implicit project of an invisible introduction of the work into Finnish and Swedish, respectively, upholding the translation pact, and giving the impression of mediating the original into another language and culture. However, in the revised translation by Warburton there was an explicit project of making the translation more text critical and scholarly, and in the case of the Saarikoski translation, there was an implicit project of emphasizing the ludic play with language in
the episodes with more explicit intertextuality and parody. Andersson’s project implicitly created a “Swedish Joyce” who would seem to have risen out of the Swedish literary terroir. Leevi Lehto’s project was a mixture of translating nonethnocentrically “from Saarikoski to Joyce”, and pragmatically “doing what Joyce did”, which in some episodes led to extremely ethnocentric translation.

The horizon of the translator is a term by which Berman means the cultural and literary context in which the translation is received and interpreted. It is the hermeneutic horizon of expectation in which the translation is read. Readers have certain expectations of literature and translation, and the publications of the first Finnish and Swedish translations highlighted the expectation of original world literature unmediated by paratexts by an invisible translator. The Swedish and Finnish retranslations, with very different translation projects and translational choices, are presented to create a similar horizon of expectation: The publications seem to promise a complete, original, source-oriented, text critical, and reliable manifest translations.

In chapter 4, “Jawbreakers about phenomenon”, I focused on the special case of translating parody in the ‘Cyclops’ episode of Ulysses. Parody presents a problem for a translator: As liberating and subversive as parody can be, it requires its reader to belong to a very specific target group who will know the referent and enjoy its subversion. This becomes problematic when the target audience is changed, as it is temporally, linguistically, and culturally in the process of translation. In the chapter I offered my own definition of parody, taking into account the comic element: Parody is an imitative and transformative intertextual strategy between textual worlds employed for a number of functions ranging from ludic irony toward the hypotext to satire towards society, creating a comic or ambivalent incongruity.

In the chapter, I analysed three different aspects of translating parody in ‘Cyclops’: 1) The recognition of parody in the translated text through signals, or coded signs, triggering a parodic reading, 2) Parody as the imitation of style and subject matter, where both form and content are equally imitated and reshaped, and 3) the stance or attitude the parodist adopts toward his or her hypotext.

In the analysis, the parodies of the ‘Cyclops’ episode of Ulysses were shown to be of roughly three general types: 1) the case of critical parody, or travesty, in which
the lofty literary style adopted was ridiculed through hyperbole, 2) the case of the classical mock-heroic, in which the imitated elevated form was treated with respect, and the surrounding society was, by contrast, satirised, and 3) the case of the ludic, ambivalent, and playful parody, which proved to be the main parodic mode of ‘Cyclops’. To the translator the deciphering and re-coding of these encoded modes of narration is essential, and different modes seemed to require different translation strategies.

In chapter 5, I discussed translating pastiche in ‘Oxen of the Sun’. The notion of pastiche is tied to the notion of an author: Who is the owner of meaning or style, to whom can a borrowed style be returned? When Joyce constructs his episode as a patchwork of imitations of recognizable writers from the history of English prose, who is the voice or the author of the text, and to what is the style and meaning of the translation to be tied? How to cut the text from its historical a priori and appropriate it to a new context and culture?

For a more tangible analysis, I formulated the following three questions: 1) What kind of intertextuality do the ‘Oxen’ pastiches represent? 2) What kind of strategies do the translators adopt to re-create the pastiches? and 3) How do the translations of the episode interanimate each other in a polyphonic macrotext? The analysis showed that there was a spectrum of pastiches from strictly stylistic pastiches to broader compilation pastiches, with different attitudes from homage to derisive critique. There were pastiches compiled from quotations and stylistic cues Joyce had lifted from anthologies for his notebook and appropriated as part of his episode, and then broader pastiches of authors Joyce was perhaps more deeply familiar with, which were based on a more abstract image of the style of that author. The analysis suggested, perhaps counter-intuitively, that these broader pastiches, based on abstract models, were easier for the translators to re-create than those compiled of quotations, orthographic clues, and syntagmatic models.

To further demonstrate the connections of the source text to its hypotexts, and the target texts to their possible hypotexts, I created a digital companion for this chapter: the Oxen of the Sun hypertext (OSH). The OSH, employing tag words, sentences and formulations, allows access to the reader of this thesis to the polyglot macrotext of Finnish and Swedish ‘Oxen’ translations, and enables comparison
between the translations in two different languages by use of literal English backtranslations.

In chapter 6, I considered a special case of intertextuality, namely intermediality, in the form of musicalization of fiction. Musicality, just like parody or pastiche, is something a reader may choose, or be able, to read into the text, given certain signals and triggers. These may range from paratextual clues to thematic allusions and textual evocations of song lyrics, to the actual modification of the signification system of literature to that of acoustics, rhythm, and music.

In the chapter, I discussed three types of musicalization following Werner Wolf’s typology: 1) thematization (or telling), 2) evocation (or quotation), and 3) imitation (or showing). The questions thematization posed on the translations had to do with the question of cultural competence. In the case of evocation of song lyrics, the problematics was akin to the questions of quotation and allusion in the cases of pastiche and parody. The mode of imitation or showing, in Wolf’s typology, ranges from imaginary content analysis to structural analogies and word music. In word music, the implicit imitation of music in literature, the translator has to perform a delicate balancing act between language and music.

I concluded my analysis with Roland Barthes’ application of Julia Kristeva’s phenotext and genotext, the symbolic and the semiotic aspect of language, respectively, to the study of acoustics and song. For Barthes, pheno-song is denotative and communicative, while geno-song flows in an uninterrupted legato line and refers ultimately to the body. The friction between these two modes, the musical and the linguistic, creates the grain de la voix in Barthes’ essay, and, in my view, in Joyce’s ‘Sirens’. The translations concentrated on the musical intricacies tended to emphasize the sense of pheno-song and fugue according to rule, as the translators playing it more by ear tended to emphasize the uninterrupted legato line of geno-song.

Despite the apparent advantages of the polyphonic view to comparative study of translated literature, and the possibilities of studying the afterlife of literary works in (re)translation in poststructural study especially of explicitly intertextual literature, the demand for further study is clear. It remains to be tested how applicable the PTM is outside the sphere of Ulysses, and of modernist and postmodernist literary translations.
on the one hand, and in other languages than from English to Finnish and Swedish on
the other. The Polyphonic Translation Model has borrowed ideas from traductology
and translation studies, but it remains to be seen how much the model and the current
study can offer in return to translation studies. For instance, further study is required
on the similarities and critical differences of *polyphonic translation* and *indirect
translation* from the field of translation studies, the cases in which the retranslation
target text has clearly not been translated from the source text, but from an earlier
translation target text in the same or in a different language.

In this study, I have put forth one central theoretical model, and one experimental
methodological device. It is my contention that my Polyphonic Translation Model is a
further step in understanding literary (re)translation as part of the intertextual field of
rereading and rewriting. The PTM gives a more detailed picture of how translations
rewrite their source texts according to their translation projects, and how these
interpretations are amended and challenged in retranslation. The polyphonic view on
(re)translation, based on the thinking of Antoine Berman, allows us to discuss, beyond
the capability of devices such as the retranslation hypothesis, domestication, and
foreignization, how translations and retranslations negotiate the polyglot macrotext of,
in this case, the Finnish and Swedish *Odysseus/Ulysses*. The work was introduced
into the language pair by Warburton’s first translation, in an astoundingly acute
hermeneutic understanding for a very early interpretation of the text to any language,
invisibly and fluently, but not without an ear for the intricacies and the playfulness of
form. This first interpretation was on Saarikoski’s desk, who added, for the first
Finnish interpretation, a layer of ludic play and Menippean satire, while still remaining
within the prevailing loyal, communicative, and invisible translation aesthetic. The
third comment to this choir of voices, after a revised Swedish edition by Warburton,
was the Swedish retranslation by Andersson, who could only take Saarikoski to
account by his, by then controversial, reputation, but did use the first Swedish
translation as a “safety net”, comparing his own interpretations to his predecessor. The
Swedish *Odysseus/Ulysses* macrotext has therefore developed in complementary
dialogue. The fourth rendition, Lehto’s Finnish retranslation, was constructed on the
Finnish first translation, “destroying it with the touch of the original”. This is why I
have described the dialogue of the Finnish *Odysseus/Ulysses* translations as an
antagonistic one, a struggle between one’s own and another’s word, but nevertheless one that dialectically enriches the Finnish and Swedish macrotext.

The methodological device, the OSH digital companion for my thesis, employing approaches from the digital humanities, has also proved advantageous for the study of translations of pastiche in the ‘Oxen of the Sun’ episode of Ulysses. While the OSH can offer no quantitative research results as to how frequently and loyally translations convey imitations in the source text, it does work as an aid to qualitative research, offering a possibility to highlight concrete lexical and syntactic traits which trigger in the reader of a pastiche the intertextual mode of reading, and a possibility to compare how those traits are conveyed in the target texts. The relationship of this study and the digital companion is not unlike that of the human-computer interaction of computer-assisted translation (CAT), in which devices like translation memories and terminology tools assist the translator in the process, instead of the interaction of machine translation (MT) devices, where the digital tool makes an attempt at the end result (in that case a translation, in this case analysis), but usually requires post-editing from a human aid. The aim of tools in which the machine aids the human process (CAT) and, in my view, my digital hypertext (OSH), is to increase human output by relieving them from mechanical, repetitive tasks. One interesting further research this study suggests would be to implement OSH-assisted analysis on larger translated fiction corpuses.

In Mikhail Bakhtin’s conception of aesthetics, and the entire human existence, the other plays a central role. Bakhtin problematizes the relationship between subject and object, and more specifically the relationship between author and hero in autobiographical texts. No subject can see himself in action, he cannot see himself as a whole, he can only reflect an image outside himself. Every subject needs other subjects to complete and consummate the picture. Noman, as it were, can give his own eulogy. The final word on everyman is spoken by the other. Likewise, in his dialogism, Bakhtin always highlights the role of the reader, the addressee of the utterance, the absolute aesthetic need of man for the other. What follows is that once the writer or sender of the utterance is long gone, the fate of books lies on the capacity of the reader.
James Joyce knew this as he wrote to the American publisher Bennett Cerf in a letter dated April 2, 1932, in response to Cerf’s request for details on the publication history of *Ulysses*: “Habent sua fata libelli” (LII, 242). This partial quotation from Terentianus Maurus’ *De litteris syllabis et metris Horatii* is the motto of my dissertation: *Pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli* (“The fate of books depends on the capacity of the reader”). The last word on any book is not uttered by the author, but a new comment on it is added by each new reader. Translators and retranslators make this practice of non-consummable, ever-changing re-reading and re-writing of literary works explicit in the translation process, in the ongoing hubbub of phenomenon.
References

Primary sources


<https://www.dn.se/kultur-noje/bokrecensioner/james-joyce-ulysses/>


Secondary sources


Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.


Appendices

Appendix 1

Leevi Lehto (LL) interview

Helsinki, Finland
November, 2009
by Lauri Niskanen (LN)

LN: How did the process of a new Finnish translation of *Ulysses* begin?


Koska minulla oli tuolloin takaani noin 15 vuoden ura ammattikääntäjänä, oli luonnollista, että kiinnostuin samalla suomennoksesta. Arvelisin myös, että runoilijana kielen sointi oli juuri tuohon aikaan alkamassa kiinnostaa minua aikaisemmasta poikkeavalla tavalla (nykyisin yksi runoilijainteetisteitäni on nimenomaan ”äänirunoilijän”): siksi kielen ja musiikin rajapinnalla taiseleva ”Seireenit”-jakso valikoitui suomennoksen tutkimisen lähtöpisteeksi. Niinpä Mollyn viimeiseen ”kyllään” päästyni laitoin Saarikosken syrjään, hain hyllystä alkuteoksensa ja istuin kääntämään ”Seireeneitä”. Tein sitä kylmiltään kynneniä liuskaa, jotka sitten näytin vaimolleni. ”Onhan tämä aivan kuin eri teos”, sanoi hen, tuolloin jo ajat sitten oman

---

This written interview was conducted in Finnish via email in 2009. Part of the interview appeared in English, translated by me, in *Cirkularundbrev* 1/2010 (Niskanen 2010, 9-14).

LN: Why is it, in your view, that a new translation is needed?

LL: Motiivini ovat osaksi pedagogiset: haluan havainnollistaa, että mikä tahansa voidaan kääntää monella tavalla ja että keskustelu käännöksen "oikeellisuudesta" on parhaimmillaankin hedelmätöntä. Tämä ei tietenkään tarkoita, että kaikki käännökset olisivat yhtä hyviä – ja Ulysseksen takia tarvitaan yksinkertaisesti myös parempi suomennos. Saarikosken käännös on hyvä lukumaani (tempasihan se minutkin mukaan) mutta on siinä myös varmaa ennätysmäärä alkeellisia virheitä ja kömmähdyksiä.

Voisi sanoa, että minulla on myös kirjallisuuspoliittinen motiivi. Palaan myöhemmässä kysymyksessäsi siihen, miten paljon Ulysses on vaikuttanut; varmaa on, että tietyt suomalaisen ns. modernistisen proosan perustava estetiikka ja

315 I was one of those to whom the question “How many times did you not read James Joyce’s Ulysses?” applied. I remember buying Pentti Saarikoski’s translation in the summer of 1967 with the prize-money I won in a poetry contest of literary magazine Parnasso. I read up until the so-called ‘turning point’ of page 200. I had later begun again several times, but something had always come up, and I never finished it. Around New Year 2001-2002 I once again picked up the book, and this time I finished it nearly without blinking an eye. I remember especially how the book sucked me in after page 200.

Having worked as a professional translator for 15 years, I was naturally intrigued by the translation aspects. I suspect also it was around that time that I, as a poet, was becoming increasingly fascinated in the sound and phonetics of language (today one of the areas of poetry I specialize in is sound poetry); therefore the ‘Sirens’ episode, balancing as it does on the boundary between language and music, became the focal point of my study of the translation. After reaching Molly’s final “yes” I put down my Saarikoski, picked up my Joyce, and sat down to translate ‘Sirens’. After about ten pages I showed it to my wife. “It’s a new text altogether,” said she, having read her Saarikoski years ago, and added: “Why don’t you translate the whole book?” I remember how strange the notion seemed to me at the time. I was rather thinking that my translating days were behind me, and that it was (finally) time for me to do “something of my own”. The idea stuck, however, and by the next New Year I found myself making finishing touches on ‘Sirens’. In January and February of 2003, I made first drafts of episodes 1-3 and sent all the four episodes to Gaudeamus publishing house to be looked over by Tuomas Seppä. Tuomas sent them to Professor Hannu K. Riikonen, who gave his support to the enterprise. Thus my Odyssey into Ulysses had begun.

LN: Your translation is called ‘Ulysses’, while the earlier Finnish translation by Pentti Saarikoski was called ‘Odysseus’. Why is this?

LL: Toisinaan Suomessa yleensä oletetaan, ”Ulysses” ei oikeastaan ole ”Odysseus” englanniksi. Englannissa molempia käytetään Homeroksen sankarin nimenä, mutta ”Odysseus” on sielläkin yleisempi. Varianttien alkuperät ovat kreikassa (”Odysseus”) ja latinassa (”Ulysses”): ”Ulysses” on siis käännetty nimi – ja uskon Joyceen valinnallaan korostaneen oman teoksenä toissijaisuutta suhteessa Homeroksen eepokseen. ”Ulysses” on siis ”jo” käännös – ja minulle tarjoutuu mielenkiintoinen mahdollisuus korostaa tästä paradoksaalisenä jättämällä teoksen nimi kääntämättä.317

316 My motives are partly pedagogical: I wish to illustrate that anything can be translated in several ways, and that discussions about correct and incorrect translations are futile. This does not mean, however, that all translations are equally good, and Ulysses is one book of which we certainly needed a better translation. Saarikoski’s translation is a readable novel, but it has a record number of simple mistakes and misconceptions.

Saarikoski’s translation is also clearly influenced by certain basic aesthetics of Finnish modernist prose, and its conception of realism. The leading theoretician of Finnish modernism, Tuomas Anhava (1927-2001), was one of the previewers of Saarikoski’s translation, and, as I always say, the result is what Joyce’s Ulysses might have become if Joyce had let Ezra Pound have his way with it. As a result, Saarikoski’s translation is a paradox: in many ways it’s like a Reader’s Digest edition, yet it is not easier, but rather harder to read than the original. The translation makes the book stronger than – as I understand – was Joyce’s intention (that intention, by the by, Anhava explicitly said he never understood). All in all the Odysseus of 1962 has probably had less influence on modern Finnish than modern Finnish prose had on it. One aim of my translation is to see if I could turn this influence around in the 21st century.

317 Contrary to common Finnish assumption ‘Ulysses’ is not ‘Odysseus’ in English. In English, both are used as the name of Homer’s hero, but ‘Odysseus’ is more common. The origins of the variants are in Greek (‘Odysseus’) and Latin (‘Ulysses’): ‘Ulysses’, therefore, is already a translated title – and I believe Joyce used this choice to highlight the otherness of his book in regard to Homer’s epic. In a
LN: Would you describe your method of translating?

LN: Which edition/editions of Ulysses are you using as your source text?
LI: Olen käyttänyt Hans Walter Gablerin vuoden 1985 [sic] editiota. Sen synoptisen version hyödyntäminen tulee olemaan tärkeä osa lopullista editointityötä.\textsuperscript{319}

LN: Are you using additional sources (translations into other languages, etc.)?
LI: Tärkein rinnakkaisteksti on ollut Giffordin ja Seidmanin Ulysses Annotated – ei välttämättä siksi, että se olisi tarkka tai kattavakaan – mutta pidän sen miltei pakkomieltävänä, että yritän löytää selittävää. Erityisesti siitä on ollut apua teoksensisäisten viitteiden tunnistamisessa. Jonkin verran olen hyödyntänyt Thomas Warburtonin toista ruotsinnosta, joka on varsin vakaa ja virheettömin, jos kohta sillä ongelmallisella tavalla, että "vaikat" kohdat on yleensä kierretty. Näin siitä ei yleensä ole ollut kouriintuntuvaa apua. Editointivaiheessa aion vielä kuljettaa rinnalla ainakin uusimpia saksannoksia ja ranskannoksia.\textsuperscript{320}

way, the title of ‘Ulysses’ is “already” translated – and I have an interesting opportunity to highlight this, paradoxically enough, by not translating it again.

\textsuperscript{318} After my first experiment with ‘Sirens’ I reverted to using Saarikoski’s translation. I scanned it episode by episode, and placed it on the right in a two-column word file. On the left column I placed the original. Then I began the systematic “destruction” of Saarikoski’s text with the touch of the original. I like to jest that I had it easy, I had the rough translation as a given. Another way to look at it would be to say that I’m translating \textit{Ulysses} from Saarikoski to Joyce.

\textsuperscript{319} I have used the Hans Walter Gabler edition of 1985 [sic]. The synoptic version of it will play a large part in the final editing of the translation.

\textsuperscript{320} The most important additional text has been Gifford and Seidman’s \textit{Ulysses Annotated} – not that it is particularly accurate or extensive – but its nearly obsessive need to explain anything and everything appeals to me. It has been very helpful in identifying intratextual allusions. At times I have consulted the second Swedish translation of Tomas Warburton, which is a solid and flawless text, although it has a problematic way of steering clear of troubled waters. Thus, it rarely offers concrete solutions. In the editing stages I plan to consult at least the latest German and French translations.
LN: What would you say is the main challenge in translating *Ulysses*, and is translating *Ulysses* very different from your earlier translation works?

LL: Voi kuulostaa hassulta, mutta *Ulysses* on ollut tähänastisista käännöstöistäni helpoin! Vaativin mutta helpoin – en osaa selittää tätä muutoin kuin sanomalla, että muista töistä poiketen Ulyssesksen jokaisessa lauseessa on ”jotakin käännettävää”.

Yleensä on toisin: yleensä valtaosa mistä tahansa tekstistä iään kääntää: ”välitä ”vain” minun merkityksen, ja vain poikkeuskohtelissa vaattii myös näyttämään, ”miten olen tässä”. Tästä syystä kääntäminen on vaikeaa – näet kun ”merkityksen” sellaisenaan siirtäminen on mahdotonta, koska siihen liittyy eksakink tarkkuuden ja yhden oikean käännöksen vaatinus. ”Miten”-puolen kääntäminen taas on aina mahdollista ja vieläpä mitä moninäisemmin tavoin – joista yksikään ei ole oikea sanan legalistisessa merkityksessä, mutta toinen voi silti olla parempi toista. Tästä seuraa, että mitä tarkemmin yritän toistaa sitä, mitä Joyce on tehnyt, sitä vapaampi olen.

321

Ulyssesksen kääntäminen tulikin merkitsemään minulle sitä pistettä, jossa (aina häilyvä) ero kirjoittamisen ja kääntämisen välillä lopullisesti pyyhkiytyi pois. Nyt en enää pitäisi täätä työttä toissijaisana mihinkään ”omaan” kirjoittamiseeni nähden.321

LN: Can you point out a single section in the book, which causes most difficulty for the translator? Is it, for example, the complex allusions of Stephen Dedalus, the word-music of the Sirens, the intertextuality of ‘Oxen’, or perhaps the unpunctuated inner monologue of Molly Bloom?

LL: Edelliseen viitaten: voisin sanoa, että vaikeimmat ovat ehdottomasti alkupuolen ”initial style” luvut. Niissä on koko ajan tarjolla vaara olettaa ”Joycen tyyli” ja unohtaa, että ne ovat periaatteessa samanlaisia pastisessa kuin loppuluvutkin, toisella, miniatyyrimaisemmalla, valmistavalla tavalla vain (ja haltuun kyseenalaistaa 1900-luvun lopun tyyliksestelussa Karen Lawrencesta – 1981 – alkaen keskeisellä sijalla

321 This may sound odd, but I have found *Ulysses* to be my easiest translation thus far! The most demanding, yet the easiest. The only way I can think of to explain this is to say that, unlike all other translation works, every sentence of *Ulysses* has “something to translate”. The usual case is quite different: usually most of any given text seems to say: ”convey only my meaning”. Only at times it asks to “convey how I am”. This makes translating difficult, since conveying meaning as such is not possible, as it would require exact correspondence and assume a single correct translation. Conveying the how, on the other hand, is always possible and in a myriad of ways – not one of them is correct, but one can be better than the other. What follows is that the more strictly I try to repeat what Joyce has done, the more freedom I have. Translating *Ulysses* became for me the point in which the constantly ambivalent borderline between writing and translating vanished entirely. I would no longer consider this work secondary to my “own original” writing.

L.N: In episode 14, ‘Oxen of the Sun’, you have decided to translate the ‘embryonic development’ of English prose by going through the history of Finnish prose style instead of, for example, alluding to those English writers Joyce parodies. Why is this?

L.L: Hyvä kysymys! Ratkaisuni käynee esimerkiksi siitä, miten ”miten”-aspektin (ks. vastaus 2.3. yllä) kääntämiseen ei ole yhtä ainoaa tapaa. ”Auringon härissä” sovellan niin sanoakseni maksimaalista kotouttamista, kun taas toisissa kohdissa käännöstä maksimaalisesti kieltäydyd kotouttamisesta – niinpä en yleensä siirrää irlantilaisia /

322 Referring to my last answer: I’d say the hardest were the early “initial style” episodes. In the first chapters there is a constant threat to assume that something is written in “Joyce’s own style” and forget that they are pastiches as much as the rest, only in a different, miniature, preliminary way (consequently I would like to question the dualistic paradigm that has been central to the stylistic debates on Ulysses since Karen Lawrence in 1981: There can be no stylistic shift in Ulysses as suggested by it).

I would say, however, with unbridled sentimentality, that for myself the most challenging episode was chapter 15, ‘Circe’. I translated it in two weeks in April 2008, alone in the countryside – and if writing it caused Joyce a kind of constant state of nausea, translating it caused me, so to say, a belated “second” sexual awakening. In all honesty I haven’t been the same ever since. ‘Circe’ is the most thorough and honest text in the history of literature – ahem, I’m still a beginner in Finnegans Wake, so I have to make a reservation for that. I would say that ‘Circe’ was the most honest until then, and that it reveals honesty itself for what it is – or rather that there is always something even behind honesty and ‘truth’. That something is by no means ambivalent relativity, absence or emptiness, but it is the most unambiguous (although infinitely complex), the most present, the most rich and the most positively active: it is desire. I “always” knew this in an abstract sense – translating Ulysses made it concrete.


---

323 Interesting question! This decision is an example that there is no one single correct way to convey the how-aspect of translation (cf. 2.3. above). In ‘Oxen of the Sun’ my technique is, so to say, categorical domestication, whereas in other parts of the novel I categorically refuse to domesticate – for the most part I don’t translate Irish/Dubliner idioms into their Finnish/Helsinkiner correspondents, because I consider Joyce has meant them to be foreign to an average English reader. (My rule of thumb has been to abstain from domesticating if Gifford & Seidman consider it necessary to add an explanation to their English readers.) In ‘Oxen of the Sun’, in my view, Joyce’s aim is slightly different: Instead of alienation he is striving for, shall we say, maximum recognition: that is exactly the way they wrote in such and such time in that part of the British Empire (presuming a reader with maximum of education and imagination, as Joyce always happily and shamelessly presumes). In this exactly-aspect Joyce is not, in fact, content with imitation – ‘Oxen of the Sun’ has more direct quotation and plagiarism than pastiche. One proof of this is that Joyce’s “parodies” stop at the point of history, where copyright laws step in (on this, cf. Paul Saint-Amour’s excellent book The Copywrights: Intellectual Property and the Literary Imagination, Cornell University Press 2003).
LN: The history of English and Finnish languages, not to mention prose styles, are very different. On what grounds did you choose the correspondences between those writers Joyce alludes to and the Finnish prose styles in your translation?


LN: Your coinage of the Finnish feminine third-person pronoun ‘hen’ in your translations has caused some discussion earlier. You have chosen to use it in Ulysses. Why is this?

Again, I aimed to “do what Joyce did”: where he had his histories of English prose style, I had Paavo Pulkkinen’s book on the development of modern Finnish (1972), with its excellent example text appendices.

Another note on domesticated idioms: Whereas Saarikoski – largely due to his limited knowledge of English – uses mostly categorical foreignization, Warburon uses categorical domestication – which is why his translations are no help in translating: if there is a word in an Irish idiom of Ulysses I don’t understand, I won’t find its direct translation in Warburton.

324 At this point I allowed myself a certain degree of freedom – the correspondences are largely associative. This was required by the temporal difference alone, since the history of written Finnish begins hundreds of years later than that of English. I considered the styles and characters of the writers – for example, a natural correspondence for John Bunyan (1628-88) seemed to be vicar Henrik Renqvist (1789-1866), who wrote on the evils of alcohol. I punished August Ahlqvist (1826-89) with Oliver Goldsmith (1728-74), and the decision to assign Aleksis Kivi (1834-72) to Laurence Sterne (1713-68) was one of the most memorable moments of joy in the translation process. These examples should not obscure the fact that the correspondences are in the end arbitrary – the histories of the languages do not run parallel, if for no other reason, because the history of a language is not in “reality” the kind of continuums Joyce in this episode makes it seem to be. Joyce does this on purpose, fully knowing the illegitimacy of his purpose, I should suspect. I on my part try to stay aware of the bastardy of the styles I implant.
Suomen yksikön kolmannen persoonan pronominin genrettömyys on ongelma melkein missä tahansa proosa- tai runostuomennoksessa, mutta Ulyssesessä poikkeuksellisen ratkeamaton sellainen siksi, että teos on – ei yksinomaan, mutta useammalla kuin yhdellä tasolla – tutkielma "feminiinisyyden mysteeristä". Tämä(kin) kulminoituu "Kirkessä", jossa Saarikosken lukijat mm. helposti jäävät tietämättömiksi siitä, että Bloom kohtaamisessaan bordellinemännän kanssa muuttuu naiseksi ja tämä taas mieheksi – ja senkin jälkeen jäävät vielä mm. kysymykset siitä, miten kääntää "hirs" ja "shis"!


325 The non-genderspecificness of the Finnish third-person pronoun is a problem in almost any prose or poetry translation into Finnish. In Ulysses it presented unprecedented problems because the novel is – not exclusively, but on several levels – a study on “the mystery of femininity”. This novel (too) culminates in ‘Circe’, in which a Finnish reader reading Saarikoski can, for example, easily miss the fact that in his encounter with Bella Cohen, Bloom turns into a woman and Bella turns into a man – and even after that you are left with the question, how to translate the terms ‘hirs’ and ‘shirs’!

I used the feminine form ‘hen’ – which is not my coinage; it was put forth by at least playwright Tauno Yliruusi years ago – in 1994 in my translation of John Ashbery’s Flow Chart. It nearly ruined the reception of the book – the few reviews it got almost unanimously denounced it for “violence against the Finnish language”. This time I have found the feedback much more relaxed, although there are still those who are still taken aback by it – always more the closer one gets to the pinnacle of the literary elite. The writer of Finnegans Wake, I believe, would not have been shocked by ‘hen’.
Appendix 2

Erik Andersson (EA) interview

Alingsås, Sweden
December, 2015
by Lauri Niskanen (LN)

LN: Do you answer questions about Joyce translation often?\[326\]

LN: It would seem the situation in Sweden was not as polemic as with the Finnish Ulysses translations. Saarikoski’s translation was heavily criticized, and then Lehto’s translation challenged both Saarikoski’s translation and the general way of translating. But, as I understand it, both your and Warburton’s translations have been well received. Could you tell me how did the process of your translation begin?
EA: Det var förlaget som frågade om jag vill göra det här.\[328\]

LN: Were you familiar with Warburton’s translation beforehand?

326 This interview was conducted in person in Andersson’s office in Alingsås in 2015. I asked the questions in English, and Andersson answered in Swedish. The interview material, transcribed and translated by me, appears here for the first time.
327 Yes. There has been a lot of interest. I have been invited to talk about the translation. And there have been a lot of interviews. It’s been fun to discuss it. I have not lectured. Instead I have asked: “What would you like to know? What are you interested in? Do you want to know about Joyce, or Ulysses, or about Irish literature, or translation in general?” And for the most part it’s translation. They want to know how it works, and what it is to begin with? What happens in translation?
328 It was the publisher who asked if I wanted to do this.
EA: Jag hade ju läst några bitar av den, jag hade inte läst hela *Ulysses* heller... Det som ja hade läst hade jag läst i hans översättning, men det var kanske 25 års sen eller så. Sen använde jag det ju mycket, Warburton’s översättning, igenom att när jag tyckte att jag var färdig med kapitel so plockade jag fram Warburton och tittade... såg om det var något ställ när det var helt olika liksom, då fick jag titta på det igen: Varför det har blivit så, vem hade det rätt? Men annars själv är översättningsarbetet så... även om jag vet där finns en tidigare översättning, så spelar det ens så mycket, det blir enda en nyöversättning i alla fall, jag hade det inte i huvudet liksom. Jag fick göra som jag tyckte. Utan det var mer som en säkerhetskontroll. När man var rädd man hade missat någonting, so blev det en extra kontroll.329

LN: There was nothing in particular you wanted to do differently from Warburton?
EA: Jag gjorde min egen. Det var inte frågan om att utgå över hans översättning.330

LN: Later on, did you find different approaches between yourself and Warburton?
EA: Nej... det är mycket lättare för dig.331

LN: What happened when you compared your and Warburton’s translations later on? What kind of corrections did you make?
EA: Jag kommer riktigt inte ihåg vad de var. Där kom ett fall när jag såg att det som Warburton har skrivit här, det är helt rätt, och det tar jag! Det finns något exempel på det. Men ofta var det inte ju riktigt... det är svårt också att ta någonting från en annan översättning för att det som stämmer i ett sammanhang kommer inte riktigt att fungera i en andra. Jag hade kanske mest nytt ut av Warburton för att när det var svårt att förstå vad det stod, Warburton hade alltid en god känsla om vad de betydde. Jag vet inte riktigt hur han kunde göra det! För att han var ju ganska ung när han översatte det. Det var hans första översättning, jag förstår. Och dessutom hade han inte hjälp ut av

329 I had read a few passages of it. I had not read the whole *Ulysses* at all. What I had read, I had read in his translation, but it was maybe 25 years ago or so. Afterwards I used it a lot, Warburton’s translation. When I thought I was finished with a chapter, I picked up Warburton and checked if there was something he had done completely different. If he did, I had another look at my text: Why is it different? Who’s got it right? But otherwise translation as a process, even when I know there is an earlier translation, it doesn’t have a big effect. It’s going to be a new translation, I don’t constantly compare it with the old. I was doing what I wanted. But it was more like a safety control. When I was afraid I had missed something, it was an extra check.
330 I made my own. It was not a question of going over his translation.
331 No ... it’s a lot easier for you.
dom här uppslagsböckerna som finns: *Ulysses reader*; till exempel, som redar ut alla hänsyftningar och sådant, som var en enorm hjälp.\footnote{I really don’t remember what they were. If I saw that what Warburton has written here, it’s just right, then I just took it! There are some examples of that. But often it was not really... it’s difficult also to take something from a different translation, because something that is correct in one context might not work in another. I had perhaps the most use out of Warburton when it was difficult to understand what the meaning was, Warburton always had a good sense of what it meant. I do not really know how he could do it! Because he was quite young when he translated it. It was his first translation, I understand. And besides, he didn’t have the help of these reading companions we now have: *Ulysses reader*, for example, which sort out all the allusions and stuff. Those were a huge help.}

\textbf{LN:} It has to affect the translation - all the research literature. You said it was a great help - can it also hinder the process, when you have to check so much information?

\textbf{EA:} Jo... det... jo det gör det! Den hindrar också. Alldeles riktigt. För att Joyce är ju en författare som leker med språket, och man kan inte översätta det... man måste liksom se lite hur han gör och tänka det kan bli lite annorlunda på ett annat språk. Är man alldeles för fast i formuleringarna eller ett precis ordval då kommer man att göra en helt annan värk. Det kommer inte länge att vara roligt, till exempel. Han är ju väldigt roligt, på många stället. Det måste man ju återskapa den situationen där det kan vara möjligt.\footnote{Yes yes... it... it does! It is a hindrance as well. Quite right. Because of course Joyce was an author who played with language, and one cannot translate it... you have to take a look at what he’s doing and think how it could work a little differently in another language. If one is too stuck on a formulation or a precise choice of words then one is writing a completely different piece. It will no longer be funny, for example. He’s very funny in many places. One must create a situation where it is still possible for him to be funny.}

\textbf{LN:} Did you consider... both of the first translations, Swedish and Finnish, are called *Odysseus* and the retranslations are both *Ulysses*. Did you have to think about the name?

\textbf{EA:} Det var ju förlaget som bestämde det. Jag tyckte ju at det skulle heta *Odysseus*, men... Det normala svenska är ju *Odysseus* - *Ulysses* är en form som nästan inte förkommer. So jag tyckte att det fanns... det gick inte att översätta till någonting som inte fanns, tyckte jag. Men jag vet inte, det kan väl heta *Ulysses* också. Jag förstår att på engelska är båda formen tänkbara, den grekiska och det latinska.\footnote{It was the publisher who made that decision. I thought it would be called *Odysseus*, but... The normal form in Swedish is *Odysseus* - *Ulysses* is a form that almost never occurs. So I thought one shouldn’t translate into something that was not used, that’s what I thought. But I don’t know, it may well also be called *Ulysses*. I understand that in English both are viable, the Greek and the Latin.}
LN: But to a Swedish reader Ulysses will sound more unfamiliar?
EA: Joa... hmm... dom som kan tänka sig läsa den där boken över huvudtaget känner väl nog till att den heter så i original. Jag tycker det är lite dumt att förlag vill gärna göra så över huvudtaget när det gäller nyöversättningen, att den ska få en ny titel också.... Dostojevskij och andra ryska romancer har fått nya titlar. Det tycker jag är lite dumt. Vilken bok har man läst egentligen?333

LN: Would you describe your translation process?
EA: Det är ju... hmm.. Jag läser ju inte igenom boken i förväg utan att jag sätter bara i gång och översätter och tar hand om problemen i den ordning som dom kommer. I just get started.336

LN: Do you make many drafts?
EA: Ja. I en normal översättning... och så skriv jag ut och så gör jag ändringar, och sen skickar jag den till förlaget. Så gör redaktören sin läsning och så får jag tillbaka det och tar ställning till och med ändringarna. Med Ulysses blev det ju fler versioner alltså. I alla fall i början så kanske det var tre sådana här utskrifter som jag gjorde, jag gick igenom den tre gånger och sen gick jag igen det tillsammans med redaktören när hon hade läst igenom så satt vi bredvid varandra och gick igenom allt ihop. I andra fall brukar jag bara skicka och den får jag tillbaka en bunt, men det här var so mycket att... det var bättre om vi kunde träffas, och man kunde resonera mera. Och sen också även när korrekturat kom så gick vi igenom det tillsammans också. Så redaktören var väldigt arrangerad i arbetet hela tiden. Jag skickade manus in i bitar.337

333 Yes ... but ... those who will be reading the book anyway will know well enough that it’s the original title. I think it’s a bit silly that publishers love to do so in any case, that when there is a new translation, it will get a new title too. Dostoevsky and other Russian novels have been given new titles. I think this is a bit silly. Which book are you reading, anyway?
336 It’s – ahem – I never read the whole book through in advance, but I just start from the beginning and handle problems in the order in which they come. I just get started.
337 Yes. In a normal translation I write out the draft and then make changes. Then I send it to the publisher. Then the editor does his reading and I get back his comments and make the amendments. With Ulysses there certainly were more versions. At least in the beginning it was maybe three drafts that I did. I went through the whole thing three times and then I went through that with the editor. When she had read it, we sat down next to each other and looked through the whole thing. With other translations, I usually only send it in and get back a bundle, but this was so much... it was better if we could meet and discuss things. And then also, even when the proofs came, we went through it together, once more. So the editor was very involved with the work all the time. I sent in the script in pieces.
LN: Do you usually have the same editor?
EA: Det var första gången jag jobbade med henne men sen har vi jobbat vidare.\footnote{It was the first time I worked with her, but we have worked together since.}

LN: What was you source text?
EA: Det var Gablers.\footnote{It was Gabler’s.}

LN: Did you use translations into other languages?
EA: Jag hade den tyska översättningen också och den danska. Hmn.... Jag kan inte säga jag hade väldig mycket hjälp av dom, det hade jag inte. Den tyska blev jag väldigt besviken på, för jag tyckte - när jag hade nått problem och tittade hur han hade gjort, då hade han ofta gjort så att han inte heller hade förstått och sen hade han liksom översätt ord-för-ord bara. Det var ju liksom obegriplig. Man måste ju ha någon idé när man översätter, att man förstår vad det handlar om, och vad idén är med den. Och sen kanske det kan bli lite fel, det kanske är inte precis vad är avsätt, men det är i alla fall någonting. Men eftersom det här var så long process...\footnote{I had the German translation and also the Danish. Erm... I cannot say I had tremendous help from them, I didn’t. The German I was very disappointed with, because I thought – when I’d come across a problem and looked how he had translated it, it often turned out he had not understood either, and then he had just translated it word-for-word, quite simply. It was incomprehensible. You have to have an idea when translating, an understanding of what it is about, what is the idea behind it. You may still get it a little wrong, maybe it’s not exactly what was said, but at least it is something. But since this was such a long process...}

LN: Four years?
EA: Jaa. Så kunde man ju... Man behövde inte lösa alla problem på en gång. Och nästa gång man kom tillbaka till det, så kanske man kom på hur det skulle vara. Och särskilt när man hade översatt igenom allt ihop då hade man ju en... då kunde man ju se verket som en helhet, när man hade översatt igenom det. Och då blev det alltså lättare att i delarna se vad det skulle vara för någonting.\footnote{Yes. So it was not necessary... One did not have to solve all the problems at once. The next time I came back to it, maybe I had found a solution. And especially when one had translated through the whole thing, then one had... then one could really see the work as a whole, when one had translated through the whole thing. And then, piece by piece, it became easier to see what it was supposed to be.}

LN: Was it different to translate Joyce and Ulysses?

LN: What was your relationship with *Ulysses* before?  

LN: Who were the Irish writers you were interested in?  
EA: Först och främst Flann O’Brien och sen Patrick Kavanaugh, och bland de nyare Colm Tóibín, som jag också har fått översätta ny på senare år.  

LN: The episodes of *Ulysses* are very different. Was there some part of the book that was especially cumbersome?  
EA: Det är ju de här nummer 14, hopplöst, skulle man säga. De kanske är lite hopplöst på engelska också. Det kanske är inte så lyckat för ett kapitel egentligen, de kan vara lite utan förklaringen att det var så svårt och göra någonting med det, men jag var alltså inne på de här som Leevi Lehto har gjort att man skulle använda den här svenska litteraturhistorien. Men jag tyckte det blev så orädda i biografen: svenska författare är ju så vildt svenska, särskilt dom gamla! Så att det skulle känna så främmande i det här sammanhanget. Och för honom, säger de ju någonstans det här med kolonialhistoria att han... det är ju mycket om de här engelska litteraturhistorien som han tar in och misshandlar. Och det är svårt att uppnå en effekt som här på något

---

342 There are no transitional passages with Joyce, there’s some idea behind everything that is in it. In most other books the main character travels somewhere, he takes a train or something – nothing much happens but you need it for intrigue’s sake and there is a little rest break. Things like that do not exist in this book. There’s all the time something interesting in each sentence. It’s a special book.  
343 I had read a few chapters only. But I was very interested in Irish literature in general, but not so much in Joyce. I was a bit frightened away, I think, when I was in a Joyce symposium in Copenhagen. It was more than I could handle. I was 23-24 years old.  
344 First and foremost, Flann O’ Brien and later Patrick Kavanaugh, and among the newer Colm Tóibín, whom I also have got to translate in recent years.
sett egentligen. Det är inte riktigt frågan om parodier heller, eller pastischer, jag vet inte riktigt...  

LN: I call them pastiche... I argue that ‘Cyclops’ has parody...  

EA: Jo... hmm... det kan man väl säga. Det är inte heller en av mina favoritkapitel. Dom är inte så roliga liksom, tycker jag.  

LN: Even if you understand the pastiche or parody, it’s hard to get to grips with what Joyce’s intended reader, or the ideal reader was. Would they have found it very funny or very poignant, or would it just seem, as it does seem, a little technical?  

EA: Men det finns ju ingen idealisk läsare! För den här romanen. De är speciellt med den... det är omöjligt att avgöra.  

LN: Did you consider or even attempt to translate it into Swedish pastiches as Lehto did in Finnish?  

EA: På svenska man får väl en känsla att de är äldre texter som liksom ligger bakom där, och man kan få en känsla att det är en litteraturhistorisk progression, men jag tror inte... man får ju inte direkt en känsla att nu är det Swift, eller någon annan så där. Men jag vet inte hur det är med engelska heller, så att man tänker att nu känner jag att det är den-och-den.  

LN: It’s been commented that in addition to being pastiche, perhaps, it is also plagiarism on Joyce’s part: It’s like a tapestry of borrowed texts.

It’s number 14. Hopeless, one could say. But then it might be a bit hopeless in English as well. It is perhaps not such a successful chapter really; it’s a little hard to understand why it needs to be so unapproachable. It’s hard to know what to make of it. I also considered what Leevi Lehto told me he had done, to use Swedish literary history in it. But I thought it would get so messy with the biographies: Swedish writers are so very Swedish, especially the old ones! So they would feel out of place in this context. And for him, don’t they say about this colonial history that he... that he takes in a lot of English literary history, and then abuses it. And it’s difficult to achieve this kind of effect in translation. It’s not really a question of parodies either, or pastiches, I don’t really...  

Yes, you could say that. That is not one of my favourite chapters either. They’re not so much fun, I think.  

But there is no ideal reader for this novel. That is what is special about it... it’s impossible to determine.  

You get the feeling in Swedish that there are older texts lying, as it were, behind the translation, and one can get a sense that there is a literary-historical progression, but I don’t think you can get an exact sense that right now this is Swift or someone else like that. But I don’t know how it is with the English either, if one can pinpoint exactly a reference to so-and-so.
EA: Han utgick från en antologi.  

LN: If you don't go for Swedish pastiche, would you then look at, for example, Swift translations?


LN: So if there was an archaic expression in Joyce, then you would find an archaic expression in Swedish?

EA: Joo... Inte so mekanisk kanske men samma frekvens i alla fall. Det var bra om det kunde finnas någon möjlighet för att förstå ordet.

LN: You use footnotes and endnotes very little. I assume you had to be aware of that in translating the book?


---

349 He took them from an anthology.
350 No, I didn’t. It’s a very complicated episode structurally, and there are many words that are nearly incomprehensible, very old-fashioned, and that was the fun part of the work to try to find corresponding old Swedish words. In other cases, when you translate other books, you may be criticized by the editor: “That word can’t be used, no one understands what it means.” But there was... this is the great thing about this book: Nothing was too incomprehensible. It was quite lovely!
351 Well yes, not so mechanically, perhaps, but with the same frequency anyway. And I preferred terms someone could understand.
 dom här olika repliken även på italienska förkommer och... lite ungerska ord finns. Vi förklarar allt.\textsuperscript{352}

LN: You were talking about the pastiches of ‘Oxen’, that since Joyce was an Irishman writing in English, that would not work the same if translated into Swedish pastiches...
EA: Kanske kunde man göra sin egen sådan bok, helt enkelt. Det blir för lite översättning och för mycket inspiration för en egen värk. Och så är ju Joyce en sådant... han är ju så inflytelserik: Han har ju redan – nästan hela 1900-talet – har han ju inspirerat så många författare så det är ju redan gjort, kan man tycka. Även i det här, som jag håller på med nu, är et kapitlet som påminner väldigt mycket om den här Nighttown kapitlet faktiskt. Det dukar upp hela tiden saker som man tänker är lite Joyce från början.\textsuperscript{353}

LN: Is retranslation different from making first translations?
EA: Nej. Jag tycker ju egentligen inte att det är annorlunda. Eller man jobbar på samma sätt i alla fall. Men det var lite annorlunda med den här... Jag översatte alltså den här Lord of the Rings också. Och där var ju en del... De här namnen var svårt att ändra på för att de var så väldigt känt. The Shire är ju Fylke på svenska, och det borde det inte vara, man borde ha hittat, använd någonting annat. Men det var, när det var några så där stället där det inte var helt fel liksom då var det bättre och behålla det här som är so välkänd. Det ställe när Elrond, han bor i en stället som heter Rivendel, och den gamle översättningen kallar det Vattnadal - och det visas, när man studerar saken - att de ortnamnet betyder inte de utan de ‘riven’ är någonting så där ‘rivet’, och den

\textsuperscript{352} I thought it would be hopeless to decide where to stop explaining. You can write an entire essay on only one sentence. However, we give translations to foreign expressions: all those words that are not in English, we give explanations in the end: a glossary. And it is something those who first read Joyce did not have, help like that. But then I thought that at that time anyone who had higher education had already read a little Latin and perhaps some Greek, so that they understood quite a lot of those two. But it is very rare today that anyone knows Latin. So it would probably be worth it to explain those. And if one is to explain them, then one really should explain all of the foreign expressions. In that way we give more help to the reader. He is given the meanings of Italian expressions and... some Hungarian words there. We explain everything.

\textsuperscript{353} Maybe you should just write your own book like that, quite simply. It’s too far from translation and too near inspiration for one’s own original text. And then of course Joyce is such a... he’s so influential: He has already – almost the entire 1900s – he has inspired so many writers, so many have followed in his footsteps, one feels. Even this, which I am translating now, one chapter in it is very similar to the Nighttown chapter actually. It pops up all the time, things that you feel are a bit Joycean in origin.
LN: What did you do with that?
EA: Där fick jag hitta på ett nytt ord.\footnote{No. I really don’t think that it is different. Or you work in the same way in any case. But it was a little different with... when I translated Lord of the Rings. And there were some... The names were difficult to change because they were so very famous. The Shire is Fylke, and it should not be, I should have found, used something else. But in those cases, if it was not absolutely wrong, then it was better to leave it as it was, because it was so well known. In one passage there’s Elrond, who lives in a place called Rivendel, and the old translation calls it Vattnadal – and it appears, when you study it – the name of the town does not mean that, rather the root ‘riven’ means something like ‘torn’ and the first translator thought ‘river’, but it is not that. If you look at what it is called in Elvish then you realize that it cannot be right.}

LN: What about quotation?
EA: När man översätter så är det ofta citat från Shakespeare eller från Bibeln, men när är det från Bibeln måste man alltid gå till den gamle översättningen för att det är ändå den som man känner igen... hur det låter liksom. [Av Shakespeare] vi använder nästan alltid den äldsta – Hagbergs översättning. Den är också riktig bra översättning. Men det är så att det ska alltså låta gammaldags för det är så som det är använd på engelska...\footnote{When you make a translation there are often quotes from Shakespeare or the Bible, but when it is from the Bible you must always go to the old translation, because that is the one people recognize... what it sounds like. As for Shakespeare, we almost always use the oldest – the Hagberg translation. It is also a very good translation. But it should also sound old fashioned, that is how it is used in English.}

LN: I was going to ask you about parody in ‘Cyclops’, where they’re in the pub, you have the parodies of elevated style. Did you compare the parodied episodes to anything? Or just go by ear?
EA: Men det var ganska lätt att förstå vad han parodier där. Den parodin med den irländska sagan om stora Finn McCool... Den har ju blivit väldigt stort genomslag för många sa att det är den enda man vet om de irländska sagorna så är det Joyce parodier på dom. Den är ju lite lättköpt parodi.\footnote{But it was pretty easy to understand what he parodies there. The parody of the Irish tale of the great Finn McCool ... It’s become really influential. Many say they only know the saga because of Joyce’s parody. Its a bit of a cheap parody, though.}
LN: The lists of clerical and official titles.... Did you think how that could be funny in translation?

EA: En del saker fungerar inte längre som parodier därför att ingen är medveten om vad dom parodierar. Man har... det är mycket som riktar sig till hur det såg ut i tidningen, det är väldigt mycket tidningspråk för många kapitel i den här boken... om hur livet på redaktionen och hur journalister fungerar och vad det är dom skriver för något. Tidningarna har ju förändrats ganska mycket i alla fall på ytligare sätt. Nu räknar man inte längre upp alla möjliga präster som har gott på någon vis tillställning utan nu räknar man upp kändisar i stället. Skulle man parodiera det nu, skulle man göra de lite annorlunda. Men man har ju viss förmåga att föreställa sig vad det är som parodieras när man läser någon parodi. Även om man inte känner till förlagan så kan man ana att det måste vara på det sättet för att det här ska vara roligt, liksom.358

LN: Parody can be playful, derogative, or... Is there a difference to a translator what is Joyce’s stance towards the text he imitates?

EA: Men Joyce är lite grann som en gammal kuplettförfattare. Om där finns en poäng att dra, så gör han ju den, liksom. Hans eget syfte är inte so tydligt, kan man ju säga. Även om han förlöjligar ju ganska mycket om dom här The Gaelic League och den nya nationalismen, men samtidigt är ju hela hans bok en del i kampen för den självständiga Irland. So även om han passar på att sparka på dom också så är han ju ändå med dom med hela sitt projekt med att göra Dublin till en spelplats med världstintresse i stället att vara en lite avkrok i det engelska imperiet. Det lilla stycket om hamnen i Killybegs, det står att det är en av världens största hamnar med skog av master och så vidare. Det är ju snarare en av världens minsta hamnar.359

358 Some things do not work anymore as parodies because no one knows what they’re parodies of. There is much in Ulysses that looks like it’s from a newspaper, about how journalists work and what it is they are writing. The newspapers have changed quite a lot, in many different ways. Now you no longer count all possible priests who attend a social affair, but now one lists celebrities instead. If you were parodying it now, you would go about it in a different way. But people have the ability to imagine what is parodied when they read a spoof. Even if they do not know the target exactly, they can imagine that it must be this way because it is meant to be fun, you know.

359 But Joyce is a bit like an old variety theatre writer. If there is a punch line to deliver, he does it. His own purpose in parody is not so clear. Although he ridicules The Gaelic League and the new nationalism quite a bit, his whole book is part of the struggle for an independent Ireland. So even if he takes the opportunity to take jibes at them, he is still with them with his project to make Dublin a venue worthy of world interest instead of being a little backwater port of the English Empire. The passage with the port of Killybegs, it says that it is one of the largest ports in the world with a forest of masts and so on. But it is in fact one of the world’s smallest ports.
LN: So the parodies of ‘Cyclops’ are easier than the pastiches of ‘Oxen of the Sun’, because they’re so inflated?

EA: Just det. Men det är ju ändå... i kapitel 14 Buck Mulligan har sitt ide om att göra en befruktningsstation. Det är ju ganska roligt, det ska man säga.360

LN: The musicalization of ‘Sirens’: How did you find translating that?

EA: Det har ju också sina speciella bekymmer med de här att dom sångerna dom sjunger är ju väldigt välbekanta sånger för en irländare, men i en andra sida inte välbekanta för en fransman, kanske inte ens för en engelsman alla gånger. Där fick jag väl översätta dom sångerna. Den kunde man ha tänkt lämna kvar dom på engelska, men jag tror inte jag gjorde det, om jag minns rätt. För att man skulle kunna hänga med om vad dom handlar om.361

LN: But also the actual narration is considered to be musicalized prose in technique: there’s supposed to be staccato and glissando and different musical techniques. How much attention did you pay to that?

EA: Det börjar ju med utdrag ur texten som kommer sen. Och där är en lite gran att man först får se som en ouvertyr man får se materialet av verket presenteras här, och sen blev det utvecklat och så. Jag kan inte säga att jag har... Om man kan tala om att det finns exempel på ett stackato eller glissando så har jag inte sätt till att försöka återskapa det på samma ställ. Det har jag inte gjort. Men däremot försökt vara vaken för själva den musikaliska, den rytmiska känslan i den där ... Jag vet inte riktigt hur väl det har slagit ut faktiskt.362

360 Exactly. But it’s still... In chapter 14 Buck Mulligan has his idea of setting up a reproduction station. That is pretty funny, I have to admit!
361 It also had its special problems with the songs that they sing: They’re very familiar songs for the Irish, but on the other hand not familiar to a Frenchman, perhaps not even for an Englishman for the most part. So there I got to translate the songs. I could have left them in English, but I don’t think I did, if I remember correctly. Because readers needed to know what was said in order to be able to keep up with what was happening.
362 It starts with extracts from the text that follows. And you can see it as an overture or a quick look at the material of the piece, which is then elaborated on. I cannot say that I have ... If you can tell that there are examples of a staccato, glissando, or so, I have not tried to re-create them in those instances. I have not done that. I have instead tried to be aware of the musical, the rhythmic feel of the episode... I do not really know how well it has turned out, actually.
LN: Do you even think it is possible to make prose musical?
EA: Det kan man värkligt undra. Prosa är váldigt tändbart... Jag skulle ju inte säga det är idealiskt att skriva musik med prosa. Det är svårt, det är váldigt oprecist, men så är ju på någon vis... Man får ju ändå en känsla att det är ett någon form av operascen i det där kapitlet i den där restaurangen. Det är inte så att det som någon säger är ju känns som bär någon musikalisk innebär snarare än någonting annat. Ungefär som man bygger upp en opera dialog.363

LN: Dichotomies of translation: form vs content. How about in ‘Sirens’, if the form is strange or musical or heightened, somehow... ?
EA: Det var ju problem med den här boken att eftersom det var så pass mycket i den som var värdigt så att förstå vad det står där liksom, så var jag ju hela tiden rädd att det skulle gå för mycket energi för det och för litet energi för att skapa det här nya verket, men jag tror att jag blev ändå lite djärvare hela tiden. Och lite mindre fast med exakt vad det stod... Om man nu använder form och innehåll, det kände som om formen var viktigare än innehållet liksom man fick inte göra kompromisser i formen för att för mig innehållet var bättre i so fall. Om man skulle göra kompromisser någonstans så var det i så fall i innehållet snarare än formen. Det är kanske särskilt till dom tre kapitel som du intresserade för so gäller det.364

LN: When a translation is ordered from you, is it always the same, or can it... do you consider to whom it is translated, or for what audience?
EA: Kanske inte medvetet direkt, men... 365

---

363 One can certainly wonder about that. Prose is verymutable; I would not say it’s idealistic to try and write music with prose. It is difficult, it is very vague, but still... One does, in any case, get a sense that there is some sort of opera stage on which that chapter in the restaurant takes place. It just feels like what they’re saying has a musical quality before anything else. Much like building up an opera dialogue.

364 The problem with this book was that because there was so much in it that was very difficult to understand, simply what it means, so I was constantly afraid it would require too much energy to understand, and leave too little energy to appreciate this work. But I think I grew a bit bolder all the time, and a little less stuck with exactly what stood on the page. If you were to use the form and content dichotomy, it felt to me the form was more important than the content. You could not compromise in form. For me the content was conveyed better in that way. If one were to make compromises somewhere, it would be the content rather than form. It is perhaps particularly to the three chapters you are interested in that it applies.

365 Maybe not consciously but...
LN: Or when the publishing house approached you, did they say “we need a very modern translation” or...

EA: Nej, jag har aldrig fått några sådana förhållningsorder utan man får uppdraget att översätta och sen får man göra det på det sätt man tycker är bäst. Man anpassar det ju något vis till sig själv, till vad man själv tycker att det skulle vara. Det kan ju förekomma att redaktören tycker att någonting är för obegripligt eller att det är för... om man använder dialekt, till exempel, så kanske får man inte göra det. Men då resonerar man ju egentligen ur hur det ser ut i originalet. Om språket liksom ligger på en viss nivå så för man försöka hamna där också i översättningen. Det är sällan att man utgår från hur man tänker publiken är. Man kan tänka att när det gäller böcker för barn och unga... När man ger ut Robinson Crusoe, till exempel, det kan göras på många olika sätt. Ofta alltså med förkortningar i texten. Men det har blivit mycket mindre populärt här på senare år, utan de anses väldigt fint att ge ut ett oförkortade upplaga, men där finns en del böcker så är det svårt att vara riktigt tacksamt för att det är oförkortade... det kan vara ganska skämt att ha en förkortad version.366

LN: Going back to Warburton: Does it seem Finnish-Swedish?

EA: Nej, jag tror inte riktigt att det är... det är ingenting som man tänker direkt på i alla fall. Det kanske går och hitta det men... Men han var nog ganska medveten om att han skulle skriva rikssvenska alltså. Möjligt också att där fanns en redaktör där som har...367

LN: In functional translation theories there is a typology of tactics to approach a translation: word-for-word, literal, philological, communicative and innovative translation. To you, what would you say is the most important thing to convey?

366 No, I have never had any kind of directions like that when I’m commissioned for a translation. You do it in the way you think is best. In a way one adapts it in some way to oneself, to what he himself thinks it should be. It can happen the editor thinks that something is incomprehensible or that it is too... if you use dialect, for example, they may say you should not do it. But it’s rather a question of how it is in the original. If the language is in a certain register, you should try to end up there too in translation. One seldom considers what he thinks the public will expect. One can imagine that when it comes to books for children and young people that it is much more like that... When you publish Robinson Crusoe, for example, it can be done in many different ways. Often it comes out as an abbreviated edition. But it has become much less popular here in recent years. They consider it very fine to give out an unabridged edition, but with some books it’s hard to be really grateful that it is unabridged... it can be quite a relief to have a shortened version.

367 No, I do not really think it does. It’s not something you immediately think of anyway. You might be able to find examples. But he was probably quite careful to write it in Swedish-Swedish. Probably there also was an editor there who took care...
EA: All of the above! En idé man kan ha är ju att man tänker att om författaren var svensk, hur skulle han ha skrivit? Det är ju ett sätt att tänka som hjälper översättaren, skulle jag vilja säga. Om man försöker sätta sig in i författarens position så följa det med att man försöker göra samma värderingar som författaren: I nästa mening, vad är det som är viktiga i den. Vad är tankegång som har fått författaren att skriva så här? Jag menar, man kan ju inte riktigt få allt när man översätter, utan vissa saker för man bestämmer sig så att ”det här så viktigt att det här måste jag ha med”. Det kan vara något med rytmen och det kan vara och det kan till och med vara visst ord som är jätteviktigt. Och då får man på något vis gå ut från det och tänka ”det där måste vara med” och sen får jag anpassa lite av det andra så att det får den betydelse som jag tror att det skulle ha. Jag tror att i varje mening så finns det... ungefär när man berättar en rolig historia, mycket historien är så att säga meningslöst i sig men de finns där för att bedda för poängen: Jag har berättat det här och det här och det här för idésmannanhanget så blir det roligt. Hopper jag över dom, den där leden där så blir de inte längre roligt. I en rolig historia är det poängen som är viktiga. Då utgår man från det, och så bygger man upp det så att historien fungerar. Och so kan man nästan se på... så kan man betrakta alla verkligheten, varje mening man ska översätta: Om det finns någon poäng med den, och det gäller att den kommer fram. Och då kan det hända att man får göra lite annorlunda än originalförfattare har gjort för att de ens ska gå fram. Och det är också möjligt att författaren har kanske inte tänkt på det sättet man tror, men på något vis måste man ändå bestämma sig för: Vad som är idén i varje mening. För annars kommer man inte att göra en egen värk. Och då får man liksom använda dom strategier det behövs för att uppnå det, och det kan vara olika saker hela tiden.368

368 All of the above! One way to think about it would be to imagine that if the author was Swedish, how would he have written this? It’s a way of thinking that helps the translator, I would say. If one tries to understand the author’s position, it follows that one attempts to make the same value judgements as the author: in this next sentence, what is important in it? What is the thinking that led the author to write like this? I mean, you cannot really get everything into a translation, you have to decide that “this is so important that this needs to be conveyed”. It can be anything like the rhythm or it can be even a certain word that is really important. And then you work from there and think “that must be so”, and then you work everything else around that, so that it gets the meaning you consider central. I think every sentence has... Like when you tell a funny story, much of the story is so to speak meaningless in itself, but those parts are there to set up the punch line: I have told you this and this and this in order for it to be funny. If I’d skip them, the set-up, the punch line will no longer work. In a funny story, it is the punch line that is important. When you keep that in mind, you’ll be able to build it up so that it works. And in that way, you can deconstruct everything you translate: You figure out the main point and then see to it that it becomes visible. And then it can happen that
LN: When, in your mind, you imagine bringing the writer over from that culture and that language, do you also bring him over in time?

they change, and the change is due to geographic and temporal... One can also say about the original work that it is stuck in its time. You cannot change Shakespeare, because you cannot, and yet Shakespeare is of course a living writer both in Swedish and Finnish. We constantly get new versions; we get these small adjustments that allow it to continue to be readable. I think they ought to translate Shakespeare into English, as well, but I think it’s impossible.