

JOYCE STUDIES IN ITALY

22

**JOYCE'S OTHERS / THE
OTHERS AND JOYCE**

Edited by
Fabio Luppi

ea
ANICIA

Volume pubblicato con il contributo di The James Joyce Italian Foundation

TUTTI I DIRITTI RISERVATI

È vietata la traduzione, la memorizzazione elettronica, la riproduzione totale o parziale, con qualsiasi mezzo, compresa la fotocopia, anche ad uso interno o didattico. L'illecito sarà penalmente perseguibile a norma dell'art.171 della legge n.633 del 22/04/ 1941.

Direttore responsabile: Franca Ruggieri
Registrazione Num.R.G, 1885/2016, Tribunale Ordinario di Cassino

ISSN 2281 – 373X

© 2020, Editoriale Anicia s.r.l. - Roma
<http://www.edizionianicia.it/store/>
info@edizionianicia.it

Single copy price: €18.00
Subscription rates (one issue annually):
Personal: €18.00
Institutional: €30.00

The journal will be published on the following website:
<https://thejamesjoyceitalianfoundation.wordpress.com/>
Purchases can be made by directly contacting the publisher and then completing a bank transfer covering the price of the book and postage costs (this is €5.00 within Italy, but varies according to the country of destination).

Address: James Joyce Italian Foundation
Dipartimento di Lingue, Culture e Letterature Straniere
Via Valco di San Paolo, 19
00146 Roma
joyce_found@os.uniroma3.it
franca.ruggieri@uniroma3.it

CONTENTS

1. JOYCE'S OTHERS / THE OTHERS AND JOYCE

Fabio Luppi

Joyce's Others / The Others and Joycen: An Introduction 9

Fritz Senn

Joycean Minutiae of Form and Content 17

Jolanta Wawrzycka

"Unrest of Spirit" (P 189): Joyce's Otherings 37

Dieter Fuchs

*Epic Geography: The Trojan War, the Great War and the
Austro-Hungarian Empire in Ulysses and Finnegans Wake* 55

Laura Pelaschiar

*From Confined Corpses to Corpsemanure. James Joyce's Other
Corpses* 71

Jonathan McCreedy

*"James Joyce Literature" and Alternative Histories in Flann
O'Brian's The Dalkey Archive and Fabrice Lardreau's
Contretemps* 87

Sonja Đurić

*The Effect of James Joyce's Ulysses on Rastko Petrović's People
Say* 101

Sara Spanghero

*Stephen, Giacomo, and the Others: 'Brief Exposures' of Female
Counterparts* 119

Marija Girevska <i>Ithaca's Latin-rooted Syntagmata in Macedonian, Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian, and Russian Translations of Ulysses: A Comparative Study</i>	135
Annalisa Federici <i>Challenging the Model: Joyce and Michel Butor</i>	151
Raffaella Leproni <i>Mirror Mirror... Edgeworth, Wilde, and Joyce in the Face of a Looking-glass</i>	171
Katharina Rajabi <i>(Not) See ourselves as others (do not) see us. Seeing blindness in Ulysses</i>	197
Andrew Goodspeed <i>'Seems a sort of joke. Read your own obituary': James Joyce in his Obituary Notices</i>	211
2. BOOK REVIEWS edited by Fabio Luppi	225
Ilaria Natali, <i>Reading the Inferno: James Joyce's Notazioni on Dante's Divine Comedy</i> (Annalisa Federici)	227
Serenella Zanotti with Rosa Maria Bollettieri, <i>James Joyce, English Teacher. Archival Explorations into Language Teaching in Early Twentieth-Century Europe</i> (Fabio Luppi)	231
CONTRIBUTORS	237

ITHACA'S LATIN-ROOTED SYNTAGMATA IN MACEDONIAN, CROATIAN, SERBIAN, BULGARIAN, AND RUSSIAN TRANSLATIONS OF *ULYSSES*

Abstract In a letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver (Nov. 25, 1921), Joyce described *Ithaca* as the “ugly duckling” of *Ulysses* explaining that it was “therefore, [his] favourite” (*JJ* 500). Drawing on these dark “dry rock pages” (*Letters I* 173), yet frighteningly human, the article explores the implications of a domesticated translation as an endangering force for retiring from the transmission of the original intention of the author when translating an unusual literary work such as *Ulysses*. By giving examples of my own struggles with the Macedonian translation of *Ulysses* (2013), this article also explores comparatively the decisions made by the translators of the Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian and Russian editions of *Ulysses*.

Keywords Ithaca, Slavic languages, Macedonian, Translation, *Ulysses*

In a letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver (Nov. 25, 1921), Joyce described ‘Ithaca’ as the “ugly duckling” of *Ulysses* explaining that it was “therefore, [his] favourite” (*JJ* 500). This last episode which Joyce announced finishing on October 29, 1921 walks in beauty against all expectations. At first glance, it seems like a very “simple” episode. What could be difficult in translating questions and answers? Well, as always and already, Joyce himself makes it difficult. These dark “dry rock pages” (*Letters I* 173) are frighteningly human in all the glory of life celebrated through 318 catechetical questions and answers “so that not only will the reader know everything and know it in the baldest coldest way, but Bloom and Stephen thereby become heavenly bodies, wanderers like the stars at which they gaze” (*Letters I* 159-60; *SL* 278). This article draws attention to the

various choices made by five Slavic translators of *Ulysses* with regard to the Latin-rooted syntagmata in ‘Ithaca’ by tracing the Russian formalists’ technique of *ostranenie* or the effect of “estrangement” (странный/strannyj = strange). The scope of the comparative analysis includes versionists who transfigured Joyce’s novel into five Slavic languages: Croatian (Paljetak, 1991), Serbian (Paunović, 2004), Bulgarian (Vasileva, 2011), Russian (Khinkis and Khoruzhy, [2000, 2007] 2013), and Macedonian (Girevska, [2013] 2019).

When, in 1916¹, the Russian Formalist Viktor Shklovsky (1893 – 1984) drafted the essay ‘Iskusstvo, kak priem’² (‘Art as Device’ or ‘Art as Technique’, published in 1919), which outlined the concept of *ostranenie*, or “defamiliarisation” for the first time, he was probably not aware of the impact this essay would have for the next hundred years, and not only in literature, but in arts in general, including architecture and fashion. For instance, the opening lines of Ezra Pound’s poem ‘The Garden’ (Like a skein of loose silk blown against a wall / She walks by the railing of a path in Kensington Gardens, /And she is dying piece-meal / of a sort of emotional anemia. 1917) echo Shklovsky’s *ostranenie* in that unexpected ending with “anemia”, almost implanted as if a foreign body, just as Vivienne Westwood’s collections being explicitly politically-charged products disturb our view on fashion as entertainment. By drawing attention to the literariness and translatability of the source text, Jiří Levý and Shklovsky’s work were crucial for the development of translation theory and this is particularly emphasised in Joyce’s work where the mundane becomes magnificent and the words become vortexes of semantically charged space. Shklovsky argues that writers should tell stories differently, that the poetic language they use to describe well-known objects or events should be different from everyday practical language, that the world should be seen with different eyes, always as if seen or experienced for the first time. André Breton and the French Surrealists were al-

¹ “In 1916, the theory of *ostranenie* appeared”. Viktor Shklovsky, ‘Bowstring. On the Dissimilarity of the Similar (1970)’ in Alexandra Berlina (ed. and trans.), *Viktor Shklovsky: A Reader*. (New York: Bloomsbury, 2017), 280.

² Виктор Шкловский, ‘Искусство, как прием’, in *О теории прозы* (Москва: Федерация, 1929), 7-23. [Viktor Šklovskij, ‘Iskusstvo, kak priem’, in *O teorii prozy* (Moskva: Federacija, 1929), 7-23.]

so very keen on this idea of telling it differently, seeing the world ‘Toujours pour la première fois’ (1934):

There’s
A way that by gazing into the void and into your absence
I have found the secret
Of loving you
Always for the first time. (Breton 2006: 152)

It is no secret that Joyce was looking for a reader who is prepared, who can find the secret of reading his works always anew, with the same enthusiasm and excitement. “*Ostranenie* is a matter of time”, explains Shklovsky, “[it] is not only a new way of seeing; it is also the dream of a new world, sunny only because it is new. Mayakovsky’s manycolored, belt-free shirt is the festive garment of a person firmly believing in tomorrow” (Shklovsky 2017: 334).

Joyce’s writing is notoriously “estranging”, and therefore makes a good example of *ostranenie* and *sdvig* (“shift” or “displacement”). Fritz Senn, in his brilliant lecture at the 2018 Trieste Joyce Summer School, explained Joyce’s foreignness as “lexiles” – lexemes that are in exile, words that are strange, odd and foreign to the English language, expressions adopted from other languages, other cultures, other countries, in one word – migrants in English-linguaterria (for instance, ‘Chrysostomos,’ *U* 1.26 or ‘tālāfānā, ālāvātār, hātākāldā, wātāklāsāt,’ 12.354). Joyce presents familiar phenomena and events in an unusual way in order to continue or renew, refresh their aesthetic perception so that we might see the world afresh. His use of Latinate roots is estranging for the English reader since they frequently generate a scientific context, and not necessarily a literary one (vernacular vs refined language: “The myopic digital calculation of coins, eructation consequent upon repletion” *U* 17.1928-29). As for the translator, this lexical choice presents an opportunity to be “closer” to the Original or the source text for the reason that Latin is an old language and as such Latin words can easily be transliterated in any of the Slavic languages preserving and conveying thus their basic meaning. Hence, the problem of lexical choice is not necessarily a problem for the translator. For instance, “For what creature was the door of egress a door of ingress? For a cat” (*U* 17.1034-35, compare *U* 17.82. “To enter or not to enter”).

This poetic image makes the usual strange, it presents the familiar image in a different light and transfers it in an unexpected context. “Art is thinking in images”, wrote Shklovsky at the beginning of his essay. In Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian and Russian translations ‘egress’ and ‘ingress’ are translated with Slavic-rooted words: ‘izlaska/ ulaska’ (Paljetak 1991: 678, Croatian); ‘izlaska/ ulaska’ (Paunović 2004: 682, Serbian); ‘излизане/ влизане’ (izlizane/ vlizane) (Vasileva 2011: 813, Bulgarian), and ‘выхождения/ вхождения’ (vyhoždenija/ vhoždenija) (Khinkis and Khoruzhy 2013 [2000]: 643, Russian), whereas the Macedonian translation follows Joyce’s stylistic device by using ‘егрес(от)/ ингрес’ (egres[ot]/ ingres) (Girevska 2019 [2013]: 780, Macedonian). Latinate roots, having a concrete, certain, tangible set of meanings, can be simply transferred or transliterated (and not necessarily translated) into any of the Slavic languages thus producing the same effect of intrusion as they have in English. This intensified sensation helps us struggle against an automatized life, which as Shklovsky puts it, “eats things, clothes, furniture, your wife, and the fear of war” (Shklovsky 2017: 80).

“Solving” these *ostranenija* composed by Joyce in a language other than English proved very enticing. The tension between faithfulness and freedom in translation is heightened in these peculiarly rounded Cyrillic letters. The task of the translator and his relation to the original text are neatly described by the Slovak scholar Anton Popovič in his essay ‘The Concept “Shift of Expression” in Translation Analysis’ as follows:

The aim of a translation is to transfer certain intellectual and aesthetic values from one language to another. This transfer is not performed directly and is not without its difficulties. The losses incurred in the process are sometimes such as to shake our faith in the very possibility of translating a work of art. Yet the act of translating may also produce the opposite result, that is, bring actual gain. This range of possibilities provides a clear indication that translation by its very nature entails certain shifts of intellectual and aesthetic values. The existence of these shifts can be verified empirically. (Popovič 1970: 78)

The problem of translation is prompted by the fact that the original text or the source text is never a single composition, or a “monolithic work” (Levy 2011 [1963]: 67), but always plural, or, as Barthes suggests, a

product woven of quotations and traces from other texts (Barthes 1986: 60). So, from the very start, the original is an intertext. And in Joyce's case, the original is an amazingly intricate and even maddening intertext. Joyce himself admitted that "[t]he task I set myself technically in writing a book from eighteen different points of view and in as many styles, all apparently unknown or undiscovered by my fellow tradesmen, that and the nature of the legend chosen would be enough to upset anyone's mental balance" (*SL* 248).

Consequently, in this state of "upset mental balance" the translator makes various choices of transferring or not transferring certain units of Joyce's texts, or of transforming others. In making these decisions, as Popovič argues, the translator's decision process is governed by norms and the translator "strives to preserve the 'norm' of the original" (Popovič 1970: 79). To be "faithful" to the original – that is the starting point. Owing to these restricting factors, certain units of the source text do not appear in the target text, and certain units become subject to modulation, and this transubstantiation depends on the "subjective view and creative initiative of the translator" (Popovič 1970: 83). Popovič suggests that these shifts occur not "because the translator wishes to 'change' a work, but because he strives to reproduce it as faithfully as possible and to grasp it in its totality, as an organic whole" (Popovič 1970: 80). These shifts of expression are inevitable in the process of translation:

Each individual method of translation is determined by the presence or absence of shifts in the various layers of the translation. All that appears as new with respect to the original, or fails to appear where it might have been expected, may be interpreted as a shift. [...] The translator also has the right to differ organically, to be independent, as long as that independence is pursued for the sake of the original, a technique applied in order to reproduce it as a living work. (Popovič 1970: 79-80)

This shift described by Popovič is closely related to the concept of "sdvig" ("shift" or "displacement") theorized by the Russian poet Aleksei Kruchenykh in *Sdvigologija ruskogo stiha* (*The Shift in Russian Verse*, 1922). In fact, "shift" and "defamiliarisation" were the main artistic devices in the aesthetics of Russian futurism. Kruchenykh defined the "semantic shift" [smyslovoj sdvig] as "[a]mbiguity, pun, reading between

the lines, parallel meaning, symbolism”. If the phrase becomes ambiguous or if the word begins to double, then this is a shift. Even if words are mixed during reading (verbal magnetism), this is also a shift. This shift, as Kruchenykh suggests, “leads to the creation of new words” (Kruchenykh 1922: 35). “The shift”, he adds, “conveys motion and space. The shift gives meaning and diversity. The shift – modern style. The shift is America rediscovered! ...” (Kruchenykh 1922: 36).

In terms of the history of *Ulysses*’s earliest translations, what is so remarkable is that Yugoslavia with Zlatko Gorjan’s translation (1957)³ into Serbo-Croatian (the official language of the Yugoslavian federation), was among the first five countries in Europe that had printed translations of the novel: only four other full translations existed before his publication – the French (1929), the German (1930), the Spanish (1945), and the Swedish (1946). In a way, Gorjan’s approach, as he explained it in his essay ‘On Translating Joyce’s *Ulysses*’, of relying upon intuition whenever he faced untranslatable expression (Gorjan 1970: 205), might be the only solution when all other solutions (in terms of research) have been exhausted. French, German or even Italian have so much more in common with English than Slavic languages, that any attempt of translating *Ulysses* into any of the latter is, in comparison, a real nightmare. Naturally, the nightmare always begins as the biggest dream one might have in the translating profession. In doing so, “[t]he translator”, argues Zlatko Gorjan, “like the writer, has his own ideals: he strives after truth and perfection, and this ambition, these aspirations, which mark the work of every sincere artist, contain the meaning of his work: to approach the ideal, because complete adequacy to the original does not exist” (Gorjan 1970: 201).

On the other side of the Atlantic, in ‘The Art of Translation’, published in *New Republic*, August 4, 1941, Vladimir Nabokov suggested the following:

We can deduce now the requirements that a translator must possess in order to be able to give an ideal version of a foreign masterpiece. First of all he must have as much talent, or at least the same kind of talent, as the au-

³ The latest Croatian translation by Luko Paljetak (1991) is more readily available.

thor he chooses. [...] Second, he must know thoroughly the two nations and the two languages involved and be perfectly acquainted with all details relating to his author's manner and methods; also, with the social background of words, their fashions, history and period associations. This leads to the third point: while having genius and knowledge he must possess the gift of mimicry and be able to act, as it were, the real author's part by impersonating his tricks of demeanor and speech, his ways and his mind, with the utmost degree of verisimilitude.⁴

According to Nabokov, “[w]hat makes this exchange of secret values possible is not only the mere contact between the words, but their exact position in regard both to the rhythm of the line and to one another. This must be taken into account by the translator”, he concludes.

In what way did these translators (Luko Paljetak, Zoran Paunović, Igljika Vasileva, Viktor Khinkis and Sergej Khoruzhy, and Marija Girevska) adhere to the norm of the original, which as Popovič had argued, “is a constant factor, unchangeable, and binding for the translator” (Popovič 1970: 83)?

Paljetak, Paunović, Vasileva, and Khinkis and Khoruzhy seem to suggest that Joyce's intention of using dry, heavily Latin-rooted lexicon may be felt as a much stronger intrusion in the context of Slavic languages and they opted for Slavic words in order to provide a pleasurable and comprehensive reading. As for the Macedonian version, this intrusion of the Other is highly and purposefully emphasized in order to refresh language and stimulate associations connected to strangeness and foreignness. Romance Latinisms tend to be scholarly terms, especially in Macedonian just as in other Slavic languages in general. For instance, in the following paragraph of *Ulysses* we read:

What various advantages would or might have resulted from a prolongation of such an extemporization?

For the guest: security of domicile and seclusion of study. For the host: rejuvenation of intelligence, vicarious satisfaction. For the hostess: disin-

⁴ Vladimir Nabokov, ‘The Art of Translation’, New Republic, August 4, 1941. Retrieved from: http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00ghalib/about/txt_nabokov_translation_1941.html.

tegration of obsession, acquisition of correct Italian pronunciation. (U 17.935-39)

Translations:

Croatian:

Koje su različite prednosti što bi **rezultirale**, ili bi mogle **rezultirati**, iz produžavanja takve **improvizacije**?

Za gosta: sigurnost krova nad glavom i mir za učenje. Za domaćina: pomlađivanje duha, zadovoljstvo zbog tuđeg zadovoljstva. Za domaćicu: obostrano salijetanje, stjecanje pravilnog italijanskog izgovora. (Paljetak 1991: 675)

Serbian:

Kakve bi još dodatne prednosti proizišle ili mogle proizići iz produženja takve **improvizacije**?

Za gosta: sugurnost doma i mir za učenje. Za domaćina: podmlađivanje duha, posredno zadovoljstvo. Za domaćicu: oslobođanje od **opsesije**, usvajanje pravilnog italijanskog **akcenta**. (Paunović 2004: 679-80)

Bulgarian:

Какви други преимущества биха могли да последват в **резултат** от продължаването на подобна **импровизация**?

За гостенина: сигурно убежище и уединение за учене. За домакина: подмладяване на **интелекта**, съпреживени радости и удоволствия. За домакинята: разпад на обзелата я обсесия и придобиване на правилно италианско произношение.

[Какви други преимушества биha могли да последват в **резултат** от продължаването на подобна **импровизация**?

За гостенина: сигурно убежище и уединение за учене. За домакина: подмладяване на **интелекта**, съпреживени радости и удоволствия. За домакинята: разпад на обзелата ja обсесия и придобиване на правилно италианско произношение.] (Vasileva 2011: 809-10)

Russian:

Какие разнообразные преимущества проистекали или могли бы проистекать от **продлонгации** подобной **импровизации**?

Для гостя: надежный кров и уединение для занятий. Для хозяина: омоложение **интеллекта**, заместительное удовлетворение. Для хозяйки: спад одержимости, достижение правильного итальянского произношения.

[Kakie raznoobraznye preimuščestva proistekali ili mogli by proistekat' ot **prolongacii** podobnoj **improvizacii**?

Dlja gostja: nadežnyj krov i uedinenie dlja zanjatij. Dlja hozjaina: omoloženie **intellekta**, zamestitel'noe udovletvorenije. Dlja hozjajki: spad oderžimosti, dostiženie pravil'nogo ital'janskogo proiznošenija.] (Khinkis and Khoruzhy 2013 [2000]: 640)

Macedonian:

Какви различни предности ќе **резултираа** или ќе можеа да **резултираат** од **продлонгацијата** на таквата **екстемпорација**?

За гостинот: сигурност на **домицил** и самотија за учење. За домаќинот: подмладување на **интелектот**, **викарна сатисфакција**. За домаќинката: **дезинтеграција** на **опсесијата**, **аквизиција** на правилен италијански изговор.

[Kakvi različni prednosti ќе **rezultiraa** ili ќе можеа да **rezultiraat** od **prolongacijata** na takvata **ekstemporacija**?

Za gostinot: sigurnost na **domicil** i samotija za učenje. Za domaćinot: podmladuvanje na **intelektot**, **vikarna satisfakcija**. Za domaćinkata: **dezintegracija** na **opsesijata**, **akvizicija** na pravilen italijanski izgovor.] (Girevska 2019 [2013]: 776)

What details were perceived or missed, significant or less significant? Some delicate stylistic nuances were transferred, and others were created and re-created. In some cases, we observe *otstranenie* (removal) and in others *ostranenie* (estrangement). In this passage it is quite clear that Joyce (deliberately) uses the word 'extemporization' (from 'extemporize' which means to say or do something on the spur of the moment, *OED*) instead of its synonym 'improvisation' which is a slightly more general term. These passages would probably seem clearer to the ordinary reader,

if we try to domesticate these words of Latin origin and make them sound more Slavic. By “bringing the author back home” instead of “sending the reader abroad”, this domesticating strategy involves “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values” (Venuti 1995: 20). If we translated these paragraphs with clearly fashioned Slavic-rooted vocabulary, not only that the translation would lose Joyce’s inherent intention of deliberately making the language more obscure, but ultimately, we would not be able to resolve many other similar problems that we come across in ‘Ithaca’. For instance, in the following passage Joyce deliberately uses synonyms such as ‘kiss’ and ‘osculation’, and by not transferring the trace of ‘osculation’ in the translation, we would fail to convey what Joyce makes strange in his parody, his deviations from “ordinary” language:

He kissed the plump mellow yellow smellow melons of her rump, on each plump melonous hemisphere, in their mellow yellow furrow, with obscure prolonged provocative melonsmellonous osculation. (*U* 2241-43)

Translations:

Croatian:

Poljubio je mirisne masne krasne slasne dinje njene stražnjice, na svakoj masnoj dinjastoj polukugli, u njihovu krasnu slasnu brazdu, prikrivenim dugim izazovnim masnimslasnim **poljupcem**. (Paljetak 1991: 714)

Serbian:

Poljubio je debeljuškaste mekane zlačane mirisne dinje njene stražnjice, obe debeljuškaste dinjaste hemisfere, posred mekane zlačane brazde, poniznim dugim izazovnim kao dinja slatkim **poljupcem**. (Paunović 2004: 714)

Bulgarian:

Целунал закръглените сладкодъхави мекосочни любеници на отзаднето ѝ, по една целувка върху всяко окълбено мекосочно полушарие, навътре помежду сладкодъхавите гънки с томителна, продължителна, възбудителна, устnodопирна **целувка**.

[**Celunal** zakraglenite sladkodahavi mekosočni ljubenici na otzadieto ѝ, po edna celuvka vārhu vsjako okālbeno mekosočno polušarie, navātre pomeždu sladkodāhavite gānki s tomitelna, prodālžitelna, vāzbuditelna, ustnodopirna **celuvka**.] (Vasileva 2011: 860)

Russian:

Он **поцеловал** смуглые круглые душистые шелковистые выпуклости ее крупа, и оба смуглые и наглые полушария, и их тенистую и пушистую ложбинку, смутным и долгим волнующим сочнобеззвучным **лобзаньем**.

[On **poceloval** smuglye kruglye dušistyje šelkovistyje vypuklosti ee krupa, i oba smuglye i naglye polušarija, i ih tenistuju pušistuju ložbinku, smutnym i dolgim volnujuščim sočnobezzvučnym **lobzan'em**.] (Khinkis and Khoruzhy 2013: 681)

Macedonian:

Toj ги **бакна** debeličkite mekičkite žoltičkite mirizlivičkite diñyčkite na nejzinoto gaze, sekoja debelička diñesta hemisfera, vo nivnata mekička žoltenikavička brazdička, so opskurna prolongirana provokativna diñestomirizлива **оскулација**.

[Toj gi **bakna** debeličkite mekičkite žoltičkite mirizlivičkite diñjički na nejzinoto gaze, sekoja debelička diñesta hemisfera, vo nivnata mekička žoltenikavička brazdička, so opskurna prolongirana provokativna diñjestomirizлива **oskulacija**.] (Girevska 2019 [2013]: 828)

‘Osculation’ does not only suggest ‘kissing’ or ‘the act of caressing with the lips’ (in addition, *OED* suggests that *osculate* implies a typically humorous context), but in mathematics (especially geometry), it is a contact of two curves (or two surfaces) at which they have a common tangent, just as the two curves of Molly’s bottom. And certainly, with Joyce words always tend to have more than one meaning.

In terms of the ‘kiss/ osculation’ example, the Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian and Russian translations focus only on the word ‘kiss’, thus exploring two different word forms of the same Slavic root, leaving no trace of the word ‘osculation’ in the end: ‘poljubio [...] poljupcem’ (Paljetak 1991: 714; Paunović 2004: 714), ‘celunal (целунал) [...] celuv-

ка (целувка)’ (Vasileva 2011: 860), ‘poceloval (поцеловал) [...] lobzan’em (лобзан’ем)’ (Khinkis and Khoruzhy 2013 [2000]: 681), and ‘bakna (бакна) [...] oskulaciija (оскулација)’ (Girevska 2019 [2013]: 828).

What is the resulting impression, the reader’s perception in the contact between the original of *Ulysses* and its translations *Улисс/ Uliis* (Macedonian), *Uliks* (Croatian and Serbian), *Улисс/ Uliss* (Russian), and *Одисеј /Odyssey* (Bulgarian)? For the reader: a familiar melody of their native language, a natural comprehension, and at times a comprehension with surprise. In Shklovsky’s words, “the poetic language must have the character of the foreign, the surprising” (Shklovsky 2017: 93).

What we call art exists in order to give back the sensation of life, in order to make us feel things, in order to make the stone stony. The goal of art is to create the sensation of seeing, and not merely recognizing, things; the device of art is the *ostranenie* of things and the complication of the form, which increases the duration and complexity of perception, as the process of perception is its own end in art and must be prolonged. Art is the means to live through the making of a thing; what has been made does not matter in art. [...] [The device of *ostranenie*] consists in not calling a thing or event by its name but describing it as if seen for the first time, as if happening for the first time. [...] The device of *ostranenie* clearly appears in another wide-spread image – the motif of the erotic pose. [...] The goal of parallelism – the goal of all imagery – is transferring an object from its usual sphere of experience to a new one, a kind of semantic change. (Shklovsky 2017: 80-2, 90, 93)

By not naming the thing directly, the writer can let the reader see it. “But I want the reader to understand always through suggestion rather than direct statement”, confessed Joyce to Frank Budgen (Budgen 1972: 21). In Gorjan’s words: “Joyce’s text is neither fluent nor accessible” (Gorjan 1970: 205).

Translators make their own choices and follow their instincts in making these decisions. They are perhaps the most alert, attentive and careful readers. They serve as mediums between the author and the reader and ensure that the reader of the translation feels the power of the original. In “rewriting” the Original they help transfer the Original to a new set of readers. They bring their own creativity inspired by the Original;

they engage in paronomasia; they regenerate literature; they recreate; they follow the footsteps of the Original Text in terms of the technique *ostranenie* (defamiliarization); they recreate not only (Joyce's) neologisms but also (his) silences and pauses. In short, as Susan Bassnett writes in one of her essays on translation, "they all play with words and the ability to play is an essential part of translation" (Bassnett 2011: 130). Or as Fritz Senn would say, "every sentence is an event in *Ulysses*, and the least a translator can do is take risks, because Joyce took risks as well".

We may argue that a translation is never perfect as the original text; that a translation is nothing more than a delay, a trace, a copy of the genuine – a humble reproduction of the archetype. And in so many ways, that is true along the axis original – translation. Translation "can only be free", says Paul de Man, "if it reveals the instability of the original, and if it reveals that instability as the linguistic tension between trope and meaning" (De Mann 1985: 33). The original is always cunning, at times in exile, but never silent. Yet a translation may become silent if in its methods and advances fails to deliver the "shouts" within the pages of the original: "A shout in the street" (*U* 2.386) "That is God", Stephen replies to Mr Deasy (*U* 2.383). As a translator, I am always fully aware of my failures, but I am equally aware that this grand literary work is necessary and valuable for the Macedonian reader for the simple reason that the translation is always human and, as Zlatko Gorjan put it, for that very reason it is also glorious (Gorjan 1970: 207). I can only hope that the pages of the Macedonian *Улис* (*Ulis*) at best whisper the eternal beauties of *Ulysses*.

Works Cited

- Barthes, Roland (1986). *The Rustle of Language* (F. Wahl ed., trans. R. Howard), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bassnett, Susan (2011). *Reflections on Translation*, Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Benjamin, Walter (1972). "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers", *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. IV/1, Frankfurt/Main: 9-21.
- Breton, André (2006). "Toujours pour la première fois" [Always for the first time], Jean-Pierre Cauvin and Mary Ann Caws (ed. and trans.),

- Poems of André Breton: A Bilingual Anthology*, Boston: Black Widow Press: 152-155.
- Budgen, Frank (1972). *James Joyce and the Making of 'Ulysses' and Other Writings*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Man, Paul (1985). "Conclusions: Walter Benjamin's 'The Task of the Translator'", *Yale French Studies* 69 [*The Lesson of Paul de Man*]. Yale University Press: 25-46. Reprinted in *The Resistance to Theory*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986: 73-105.
- Džojš, Džejms (2004). *Uliks* (trans. Zoran Paunović), Beograd: Geopoetika.
- Džojš, Džejms (2011). *Odisej* (trans. Igljka Vasileva), Sofija: Iztok-Zapad. [Джойс, Джеймс (2011). *Одисеј*, trans. Иглика Василева, Софија: Изток-Запад.]
- Džojš, Džejms (2013). *Uliss* (trans. Viktor Hinkis, Sergej Horužij), Moskva: Inostranka. [Джойс, Джеймс (2013 [2000]). *Улисс*, trans. Виктор Хинкис, Сергей Хоружий, Москва: Иностранка.]
- Džojš, Džejms (2019 [2013]). *Ulis* (trans. Marija Girevska), Skopje: Polisa. [Џојс, Џејмс (2019 [2013]). *Улис*, trans. Марија Гиревска, Скопје: Полица.]
- Gorjan, Zlatko (1970). "On Translating Joyce's *Ulysses*", in James E. Holmes (ed.). *The Nature of Translation*, Mouton, Hague, Paris: Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences Bratislava: 201-207
- Ellmann, Richard (1992). *Selected Letters of James Joyce*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Joyce, James (1986). *Ulysses: The Corrected Text* (Hans Walter Gabler et al. eds.), New York: Vintage Books.
- Joyce, James (1991). *Uliks* (trans. Luko Paljetak), Opatija: Otokar Keršovani.
- Kruchenykh, Aleksei (1922). *Sdvigologija russkogo stiha (traktat običal'nyj i poučalnyj)*. Moskva.
- Levy, Jiří (1963). *Umění překladu*, Praha: Čs. spisovatel. Published in English as *The Art of Translation* (trans. Patrick Corness and ed. Zuzana Jettmarová), Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011.

- Nabokov, Vladimir. 'The Art of Translation', *New Republic*, August 4, 1941. Retrieved from: http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00ghalib/about/txt_nabokov_translation_1941.html.
- Popovič, Anton (1970). "The Concept of 'Shift of Expression' in Translation Analysis", in James Holmes (ed.). *The Nature of Translation*, The Hague and Paris: Mouton: 78-87.
- Shklovsky, Viktor (2017a). "Art, as Device (1917/1919)", Alexandra Berlina (ed. and trans.). *Viktor Shklovsky: A Reader*, New York: Bloomsbury: 73-96.
- Shklovsky, Viktor (2017b). "Ostranenie", Alexandra Berlina (ed. and trans.). *Viktor Shklovsky: A Reader*, New York: Bloomsbury: 334.
- Šklovskij, Viktor (1929). "Iskusstvo, kak priem", *O teorii prozy*. Moskva: Federacija: 7-23. [Шкловский, Виктор (1929). "Искусство, как прием" in *О теории прозы*, Москва: Федерация, 7-23.]
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.