

What if Uncle Charles was a woman? Italian retranslations and the re-characterization of Joyce's female voices

Monica Paulis 

University of Antwerp, Belgium



ABSTRACT

It is well-known that Joyce's third-person narrators tend to mimic the characters' idiolectic ways of expression. However, the rendering of characters' idiolects through such multi-voiced narration, and therefore the way in which these characters are portrayed, has not always stood the test of translation. Especially in the early Italian translations, the rendering of multi-voiced narration suffers from the standardization of linguistic variation. As Joyce uses the characters' idiolects as a means of characterization, this results in a flattening not only of the characters' voices, but of their psychological traits in general as well.

The Italian retranslations, however, standardize less, show more linguistic and stylistic variety and reproduce more of the source text multi-voicedness. Retranslation can therefore be seen, in this case, as a means for re-characterization, especially when investigating female voices. As we will argue, this progressively more and more dialogical re-characterization of Joyce's female voices can be explained by changing adequacy norms – related to an increased knowledge and understanding of narrative features in Joyce, such as the Uncle Charles Principle – and acceptability norms related to female voices that were considered obscene or socially unacceptable at the time of the first translations.

Keywords: retranslation, multi-voicedness, heterology, female re-characterization, James Joyce

Kaj če je bil stric Charles ženska? Ponovni prevodi v italijanščino in ponovna karakterizacija Joyceovih ženskih glasov

IZVLEČEK

Znano je, da Joyceov tretjeosebni pripovedovalec navadno oponaša idiolektno izražanje literarnih oseb. Vendar izražanje idiolektov posameznih oseb v pripovedi s toliko različnimi pripovedovalci in posledična predstavitev posameznih likov nista bila vedno uspešno prenešena v prevodih. Zlasti v zgodnjih italijanskih prevodih je bila razlika med različnimi pripovedovalci izgubljena zaradi uporabe standardne jezikovne rabe v prevodu. Ker Joyce uporablja idiolekte za oris značaja posameznih literarnih oseb, izguba specifičnih idiolektov v prevodu pomeni, da se izravnavajo ne le njihovi glasovi, temveč pogosto tudi njihove psihološke značilnosti.

Ponovni prevodi v italijanščino pa naracijo standardizirajo v mnogo manjši meri in izkazujejo večje jezikovne in slogovne variacije ter tako ohranjajo večglasno naracijo. Ponovni prevodi v italijanšči-

no postanejo načini ponovne karakterizacije, zlasti pri prevajanju ženskih glasov pripovedovalk. Zagovarjali bomo stališče, da lahko to postopno vedno bolj dialoško ponovno karakterizacijo Joyceovih ženskih glasov razložimo s spreminjanjem norm prevodne ustreznosti – kar je povezano z boljšim poznavanjem in razumevanjem Joyceovih narativnih značilnosti, npr. »načela strica Charlesa« – in norm sprejemljivosti, ki se nanašajo na ženske glasove, za katere je v času prvih prevodov veljalo, da so obsceni ali družbeno nesprejemljivi.

Ključne besede: ponovni prevod, večglasnost, heterologija, ponovna karakterizacija žensk, James Joyce

1. Introduction

Since Hugh Kenner, in *Joyce's Voices* (1978), coined the so-called Uncle Charles Principle, it has been well-accepted that Joyce's third-person narrators often mimic characters' idiolectic ways of expression, which results in multi-voiced discourse (Bakhtin, 1984) that shows both the character's and narrator's voices. In this short case study, the focus will be on such passages containing the Uncle Charles Principle, while specifically paying attention to female voices, and the way in which these female voices present in the narrator's voice were translated in early Italian translations, and in more recent Italian retranslations.

Looking at Joyce's female voices, which are mainly inner voices expressed through the narrator's multi-voiced discourse, is interesting because inner voices are more easily overlooked, especially in early translations, which were made at a time when the Uncle Charles Principle was still unknown as such. As a result of this loss of multi-voicedness in early translations, Joyce's female voices tend to lose their original complexity when translated.

Indeed, it is through the use of multi-voiced discourse that Joyce's narration bestows these female characters with complex psychological traits. These are the result of their individual private voices, as well as of social voices and discourses they may have internalized. This is the case with the famous example of Molly Bloom's inner monologue in the final chapter of *Ulysses*, the intimacy of which was, at the time of publication, widely considered obscene. As a result, acceptability norms (Toury, 2012) led the first translators to adjust the tone of Molly's inner voice, in order to meet the expectations of the target culture. In addition, other, less notorious and conspicuous female inner voices, especially the ones present in multi-voiced discourse, were easily overlooked by the early translators, who were not as well informed about Joyce's narrative voices as we are today. When reading the first Italian translations it can in fact feel at times as if female inner voices were either left out, or replaced by more acceptable outer voices, in order to meet the expectations of the receiving cultural system, taking into account what the translators deemed to be socially acceptable.

However, both knowledge of the source text's narrative features and social and translational acceptability norms change over time. Retranslators, as compared to early translators, operate in a changed target context, while having the double advantage of being able to rely on scholarship – not only Kenner, but also for instance Don Gifford's (1988) annotations to *Ulysses* – and to make use of the existing translations (Peeters and Sanz Gallego 2020; Van Poucke 2020). This is why it is worthwhile investigating how the Italian retranslators have translated Joyce's female voices. In what follows, we will examine what precisely it is that changes between the early translations and the retranslations, when female inner voices present in multi-voiced discourse are translated. For this, we will rely on a theoretical framework that is explained in the following paragraphs.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1 The Uncle Charles Principle, multi-voicedness and heterology

The Uncle Charles Principle is an expression coined by Hugh Kenner (1978, 18–21) to describe Joyce's tendency of having his third-person narrator talk about characters while using their idiom, tone and style, thus reflecting the language every particular character would have used in direct speech (as they would have in a play). Put otherwise, the Uncle Charles Principle occurs when narrators use what Bakhtin called multi-voiced discourse (1984, 32–42; 181–204), i.e., when one voice (in this case, the narrator's) re-uses a previous or other voice (the character's), so that both voices are present in discourse, one voice in, or through, the other, the former remaining recognizable as such although being voiced by the latter. From a Bakhtinian, i.e., dialogical perspective, multi-voicedness can in fact be defined as the presence of the character's voice (often inner voice, expressing his or her inner thoughts), inside the narrator's voice. Put simply: the narrator mimics the characters' idiom, re-using their voices or inner voices, thus characterizing them, by their specific use of language, as being working or middle-class, well- or less educated, resolved or hesitant, strict Catholic or liberal, and so on.

Through the use of this narrative strategy, the characters' psychology is revealed between the lines, so to say, i.e., in linguistic and stylistic variety that permeates the narrator's discourse, rather than being explicitly narrated or quoted through the more formal and literal voice of a detached third-person narrator. While Kenner (1978) describes this phenomenon as typical of third-person narration, multi-voicedness, as will be shown in this article, can also occur in dialogue, in free indirect speech and in stream-of-consciousness.

The narrative feature of multi-voicedness is narrowly related to a linguistic feature Bakhtin calls heterology, that is, the stylistic and sociolinguistic variety of social and individual voices, e.g., social, professional, historical linguistic variation and idiolects, upon which the narration is built (Todorov 1984; Peeters 2016). Heterology represents one of the main concepts of Bakhtin's epistemology of discourse (i.e., dialogism), within which he describes language as a form constantly being reshaped by the interaction with and incorporation of pre-existing linguistic material (Peeters 2016). From this perspective, as Bakhtin argues in his 1986 essay "Discourse in the novel", texts are always rooted in and shaped by the historical and socio-ideological context in which they are composed.

In the specific case of Joyce's work, each character uses his or her own idiolectic variety of contemporary English, including social heterology, for instance, or other variations depending on geographical area (i.e., English as it was spoken in Dublin), age, professional background, education level, and gender. Language variation (heterology) thus becomes, as will be demonstrated in this paper, an essential means of characterization and of the creation of 'real' characters, with a perceivable personality and a psychology of their own.

Keeping in mind that multi-voicedness, as shown by Kenner's *Uncle Charles Principle* (1978) is a narrative feature, and that Bakhtin's heterology, on the other hand, is a linguistic-stylistic feature, it can be observed that passages displaying multi-voicedness tend to contain linguistic elements categorizable as heterology. Multi-voicedness as a narrative issue and heterology as a stylistic issue are in fact the two sides of the same coin, much like content and form. Both permeate Joyce's polyphonic work and contribute to the way in which Joycean characters are being portrayed.

However, the story does not end here. Indeed, multi-voicedness and heterology are applicable to any new utterance, as our 'Self', according to Bakhtin, dialogically interacts with the world from the unique space-time position where it exists, which in turn shapes the meaning of every perception (Holquist 2002, 21). Put otherwise, whereas literary texts are rooted in the historical and socio-ideological context of the time and place in which they were written, their interpretation is equally influenced by context. This is why a literary text, when it is translated, is confronted with yet another dialogical voice, namely the translator's voice, who is revoicing the voices contained in the source text, while operating in his or her own (target) context. From a dialogical perspective, the target text can therefore be considered as the product of a dialogical process in which the translator incorporates the author's voice (which in turn includes the narrator's voice, that, in the case of Joyce's multi-voiced narrative, includes characters' voices) into his or her own voice. Translation can therefore be regarded as a dialogic

act (Peeters 2016): when a text containing multi-voiced discourse is translated, the translator's voice adds up to the "polyphony of social and discursive forces" (Holquist 2002, 69). When it is retranslated, yet another dialogical voice is added. As argued by Peeters (2016, 2021), retranslation can be defined as the result of a dialogical process "to the second degree" (Peeters 2021, 14): retranslators interact with the source text both directly, and through their interaction with previous translations which themselves interacted with the source text. This is why traces of previous translators' voices are often perceivable in retranslations (Van Poucke 2020).

2.2 Two retranslation hypotheses

While studying what happens to passages from the source text displaying the Uncle Charles Principle with female voices, attention will be paid to two retranslation hypotheses, by Chesterman (2000) who relied on Berman (1990), and by Peeters and Sanz Gallego (2020). Chesterman's well-known Retranslation Hypothesis, which has been widely tested by many scholars on world literature retranslation corpora, proposes that early translations are more 'target-oriented: early translations tend to flatten out linguistically and culturally foreign or strange elements of the source text, in order to allow the translated text to be more easily welcomed into the target culture. Retranslations, on the other hand, are said to be more source-oriented. By this it is meant that retranslators can more freely concentrate on rendering the source text content and form, as they have to worry less about introducing the source text to the target system since early translations already secured the presence of the title in the target culture. As we saw earlier, retranslators can also rely on the previous translators' work, and have a better knowledge of the source text's most typical characteristics.

Peeters and Sanz Gallego's Re-dialogization Hypothesis, on the other hand, revisits Chesterman's Retranslation Hypothesis, arguing that retranslations, as opposed to first translations, are not exactly more source-oriented, but rather more '*both source-and-target-oriented*' (Peeters 2016; Peeters and Sanz Gallego 2020) or '*source-through-target-oriented*' (Peeters 2021). By this, the authors mean that retranslations establish a more intensely dialogic relationship between adequacy and acceptability (Tourey 2012). The reason for this is that retranslations interact not only with the source text, but also with the earlier translations (see also Van Poucke 2020), which are themselves target texts of the same source text. As a result, the nexus of adequacy and acceptability is dialogized through retranslation, i.e., more voices, both source and target voices (the author's voice in the source text, including narrators' and characters' voices, the earlier translators' voices and the retranslator's voice) are dialogically intertwined. Peeters and Sanz Gallego (2020) further show that, as a result of this dialogization of source

and target voices, retranslations tend to incorporate more linguistic and stylistic variety (heterology, Bakhtin 1984), coming from both the translators' and the author's, narrators' and characters' voices. Put otherwise, retranslations standardize and conventionalize less than early translations do the language they use, as they leave more room to different voices and therefore heterology. As a result of dialogization, retranslations also explicitate less, and even de-explicitate earlier translations, thus re-establishing not only the ambiguity of voices, but ambiguity in general.

Indeed, Peeters and Sanz Gallego (2020), as well as Van Poucke (2020), provide evidence that retranslators reuse the work done by previous translators. Previous translators' voices are thus often incorporated in retranslations, either by the reuse of certain words or phrases (Van Poucke 2020), or in contrast, by the polemical refusal to reuse certain translation solutions (Peeters and Sanz Gallego 2020). In other words, retranslations tend to restore elements present in the original, yet lost or downplayed in early translations, thanks to the fact that retranslators have more material at their disposal: the source text, yet also previously published target texts, epitexts, critical works published after the completion of earlier translations.

3. Methodological approach

While studying what happens in subsequent Italian translations to passages from the source text displaying the Uncle Charles Principle with female voices, attention will be paid to the two retranslation hypotheses presented above. Our aim is to study what precisely happens to Joyce's female voices in early translations, and in retranslations, and to assess how the translation process may influence the characterization of female characters, through instances of standardization and conventionalization, of explicitation and restoration of heterology and ambiguity. We shall do so by comparing several illustrative passages from *Ulysses*, *Finnegans Wake* and *Dubliners*, containing female (inner) voices which display heterological elements.

Keeping in mind the theoretical framework presented above, the research questions that will be addressed during the textual analyses are the following. First, concerning the source text: what are the specificities of Joyce's female voices in passages displaying the Uncle Charles Principle? Then, concerning first and early translations: What happens in early translations to passages displaying the Uncle Charles Principle when translated? Are multi-voicedness and heterology rendered? If this is the case, how precisely are they rendered? If it is not the case, then how are female voices altered in translation? And finally concerning the retranslations: What happens to these features in retranslation? If multi-voicedness and heterology were lost in earlier translations, were they

restored in the retranslations, and if so, how did this happen and with what effects on female characterization?

During the textual comparison, the main question that will be addressed is thus: What are the main differences between early translations and retranslations, when it comes to multi-voicedness and heterology, and can these differences be explained by the two above mentioned hypotheses?

The selection of passages which will be analysed in this paper all display Kenner's Uncle Charles Principle while involving female voices. Each passage was selected for two reasons. First, each passage is an illustrative example of translation behaviour that is observable throughout the texts, but for which the limited scope of this paper does not allow for an extensive analysis, although many examples are shown in this study. Second, each example demonstrates the presence of female inner voices through a different narrative mode, starting with stream-of-consciousness, in which female voices are very visible, and ending with third person narration, in which multi-voicedness can be less clear and female voices could easily have been overlooked, especially, as we hypothesize, by early translators.

Further, for sake of clarity and because space is limited, we have decided, although *Ulysses*, *Finnegans Wake* and *Dubliners* have been (re)translated multiple times into Italian, to concentrate on a single early translation and a single more recent retranslation. For *Ulysses*, we shall compare Giulio De Angelis' 1960 translation (based on the Gabler edition) and Bona Flecchia's 1995 retranslation (based on the first edition, known as the Gilbert edition); for *Finnegans Wake*, we will look at James Joyce and Nino Frank's 1938, (self)translation and Luigi Schenoni's 1982 retranslation; finally for *Dubliners*, the comparison will be between Franca Cancogni's 1949 early translation and Marina Emo Capodilista's 1974 retranslation, the most reprinted one to date.

4. Comparative analysis

4.1 Multi-voicedness and heterology in stream-of-consciousness

Our first example is taken from Molly's famous inner monologue (stream-of-consciousness) in the final chapter of *Ulysses*, which is not itself multi-voiced discourse as it is a monologue. However, inside Molly's stream-of-consciousness, multi-voicedness occurs when she recollects the text of a postcard Hester sent her after she left Gibraltar. In the passage quoted below, Mrs. Stanhope's voice is discernible from Molly's own, as it is marked by the use of abbreviations (such as "Gib" and "yrs affly"), nicknames (such as "Doggerina" and "wogger"), upper-class vocabulary (such as "scrumptious") and a tone of reproach (in "be sure and write soon").

Both the Gabler and Gilbert editions are quoted below, since De Angelis' first Italian translation is based on Gabler, while the first retranslator used the first edition (known as the Gilbert edition) as her source text.

Excerpt 1

"what a shame my dearest **Doggerina** she wrote on what she was very nice [...] have just had a jolly warm bath and feel a very clean dog now enjoyed it **wogger** she called him wogger **wd** give anything to be back in **Gib** and hear you sing [...] **dont** you will always think of the **lovely teas** we had together **scrumptious** currant **scones** and raspberry **wafers** I **adore** well now dearest Doggerina be sure and write soon **kind she left out regards to your father** also Captain Grove with love **yrs affly x x x x x**". (Joyce 2010, 656–657, Gilbert edition)

"what a shame my dearest **Doggerina** she wrote on it she was very nice [...] have just had a jolly warm bath and feel a very clean dog now enjoyed it **wogger** she called him wogger **wd** give anything to be back in **Gib** and hear you sing [...] **dont** you will always think of the **lovely teas** we had together **scrumptious** currant **scones** and raspberry **wafers** I **adore** well now dearest Doggerina be sure and write soon **kind she left out regards to your father** also Captain Grove with love **yrs affly** Hester x x x x x". (Joyce 2008, 621–622, Gabler edition)

"che peccato mia **piccola Cagnolina** scriveva era molto gentile [...] ho fatto un bel bagno caldo e mi sento come un cagnolino **bello pulito** ora m'ha fatto piacere **cocco** lo chiamava cocco darebbe qualsiasi cosa per tornare a **Gib** e sentirti cantare [...] non mi scorderò mai di quei **deliziosi tè** che si prendevano insieme **fantastici scones** con l'uvetta e **cialde** al lampone che io adoro e ora mia cara Cagnolina **non mancare di scrivere presto distinti non ce lo mise** saluti a tuo padre e anche al capitano Grove affettuosamente **tua affma** Hester x x x x x". (Joyce 1960, 1886–1888. Translated by Giulio De Angelis after Gabler)

"che peccato mia **carissima Doggerina** ci scrisse sopra **lei sì** che era proprio gentile [...] ho appena fatto un bel bagno caldo e mi sento come un cagnolino **tutto lindo** ora **m** ha fatto piacere **cucci** lo chiamava cucci farebbe qualsiasi cosa per essere di nuovo a **Gib** e sentirti cantare [...] non ti ricorderai forse per sempre dei **piacevoli te** che abbiamo preso e **appetitosi panini** all'uvetta e **wafers** al lampone che adoro **be** ora carissima Dogger-

rina stai bene **scrivimi presto** saluti **gentile a non scrivere distinti** a tuo padre pure al capitano Grove con affetto **tua affma** x x x x x”.

(Joyce 1995, 582. Translated by Bona Flecchia after Gilbert)

De Angelis, in what is the first Italian translation of *Ulysses*, flattens out the psychological characterization of Mrs. Stanhope and does not allow for Molly’s feelings towards her to emerge. This is mostly visible in the sentence “kind she left out regards to your father”, which is multi-voiced, as it implies both a word left out in Mrs. Stanhope’s formula “regards to your father”, and Molly’s reaction to this.

De Angelis’ translation, “distinti non ce lo mise saluti a suo padre”, in fact, interprets the sentence as “(‘kind’ she left out) regards to your father”, conveying a rather mechanical recollection of the text and only feebly suggesting, if at all, that Molly might have perceived a simple “regards” as colder and more detached than the “kind regards” she might have expected.

Flecchia, on the other hand, catches and transposes the emotion in Molly’s voice, as she translates “saluti gentile a non scrivere distinti a tuo padre”, that is, “regards (how kind of her not to write ‘kind’) to your father” (our backtranslation), in which a note of sarcasm and, thus, Molly’s voice can more clearly be perceived.

Except from reintroducing Molly’s stance, Flecchia also compensates for the loss of “wd” with the abbreviation of another word in the same phrase (“m” for “mi”). Furthermore, her rendering is multi-voiced, as it incorporates more of the original heterology, such as the reintroduced “well” (in Italian “be”), which was omitted in De Angelis’. On the other hand, however, her retranslation is less explicating, i.e., ‘closer’ to the source text, as she re-establishes “Doggerina” and “wafers”, which had both been Italianized in the first translation, with “Cagnolina” and “cialde”.

4.2 Multi-voicedness and heterology in free indirect speech

In the second example, also taken from *Ulysses*, Molly’s and Josie’s voices resonate through Leopold Bloom’s voice, who is re-staging a conversation (free indirect speech) which had occurred between the two women, using a variety of heterological elements, such as sayings and exaggerated reactions, like “delighted” and “splendid”. As it is characters’ voices (Molly and Josie) inside another character’s voice (Leopold), which is, in turn, inside (by means of Kenner’s Uncle Charles Principle) the narrator’s voice, we could say that this passage is multi-voiced to the second degree. Furthermore, a tone of reproach similar to the one in Mrs. Stanhope’s postcard mentioned

above, can be perceived in “be sure now and write to me” as well. The passage closes with Leopold Bloom stepping back into his own voice, giving his opinion about the palpable insincerity of the feelings exchanged by the two women, by adding “Wouldn’t lend each other a pinch of salt”.

Excerpt 2

“Be sure now and write to me. And I’ll write to you. Now won’t you? Molly and Josie Powell. Till **Mr Right** comes along, then meet **once in a blue moon**. *Tableau!* O, look who it is **for the love of God!** How are you at all? What have you been doing with yourself? Kiss and **delighted** to, kiss, to see you. Picking holes in each other’s appearance. You’re looking **splendid**. **Sister souls** showing their teeth at one another. How many have you left? Wouldn’t lend each other a pinch of salt.” (Joyce 2010, 333–334, Gilbert edition)

“Be sure now and write to me. And I’ll write to you. Now won’t you? Molly and Josie Powell. Till **Mr Right** comes along, then meet **once in a blue moon**. *Tableau!* O, look who it is **for the love of God!** How are you at all? What have you been doing with yourself? Kiss and **delighted** to, kiss, to see you. Picking holes in each other’s appearance. You’re looking **splendid**. **Sister souls**. Showing their teeth at one another. How many have you left? Wouldn’t lend each other a pinch of salt.” (Joyce 2008, 302, Gabler edition)

“Bada bene di scrivermi ora. E io ti scriverò. Vero che lo farai? Molly e Josie Powell. Finché non arriva **l’uomo del sogno**, allora ci si vede **una volta ogni morte di papa**. *Tableau!* **Oh**, guarda chi si vede **per amor di Dio!** E come va? **Che ne è stato di te?** **Si baciano** e felice di, **si baciano**, di vederti. A cercar difetti l’una nell’aspetto dell’altra. **Hai un ottimo aspetto!** **Anime gemelle**. Si mostrano i denti. Quanti te ne restano? **Non alzerebbero un dito l’una per l’altra.**”

(Joyce 1960, 1034. Translated by Giulio De Angelis after Gabler)

“E non dimenticarti di scrivere. E io ti scriverò. Lo farai? Molly e Josie Powell. Finché non trovi **l’uomo ideale** e poi s’incontrano **ad ogni morte di papa**. *Tableau!* **O** guarda chi si vede! Come stai? **Che ti è capitato?** **Bacio** e sono proprio contenta, **bacio** di vederti. A cercar difetti una nell’as-

petto dell'altra. **Sei splendida. Sorelle di spirito** che si mostrano i denti.
Quanti te ne restano? **Non alzerebbero un dito l'una per l'altra.**"

(Joyce 1995, 288. Translated by Bona Flecchia after Gilbert)

A polemical reaction to De Angelis' translation can be observed where Flecchia rectifies instances of mistranslation, such as "anime gemelle" (which in Italian means "soul mates", rather than "sister souls"), that she retranslates as "sorelle di spirito", while, on the other hand, De Angelis' voice is also being re-used (for example by copying "Non alzerebbero un dito l'una per l'altra"). The retranslation also is more multi-voiced, as it displays more natural and colloquial expressions as to render the original's heterology represented by the many sayings uttered in the conversation; finally, here as well, Flecchia's retranslation is also less explicating, as she re-establishes the multi-voiced "bacio... bacio" for "kiss... kiss" (which is something you could hear them say, in their affected manner), as opposed to De Angelis' third-person rendering "si baciano... si baciano" (they kiss each other... they kiss each other).

4.3 Multi-voicedness and heterology in dialogue

A third example is taken from the *Finnegans Wake's* chapter "Anna Livia Plurabelle", where the two washerwomen are chatting while doing their washing on either side of the river *amnis livia* (of which Anna Livia is the personification). In this dialogue, Anna Livia's voice is conveyed through the voice of one of the washerwomen, as the washerwoman incorporates Anna Livia's voice into her own, while talking about the latter. This assimilation is made perceivable by the use of a language variation peppered with refined yet distorted expressions and heterologic elements (furthermore displaying heteroglossic nuances), as if the washerwoman were mocking Anna Livia's haughty attitude. As Bollettieri (2009, 31) points out, in this chapter the boundaries between national languages are constantly put to the test through the use of loanwords and through linguistic corruption, resulting in a progressive estrangement of meaning, which in turn challenges the translators to re-invent their target language. And Joyce wasn't only daring his translators, but he took up the challenge of translating the passage into Italian himself, together with Nino Frank.

Excerpt 3

"And there she was, Anna Livia, she **darent catch a wrinkle of sleep, purling around like a chit of [a] child**, [Wendawanda, a fingerthick], in

a **Lapsummer** skirt and **damazon** cheeks, **for to ishim bonzour** to her **dear dubber Dan**". (Joyce 1928, 14)

"Ed eccotela, l'Anna Livia, che **non osonava pisolottare**, smerlando attorno come **bimbuccia**, Trento soldi di gonna e le **gote ardanti**, **per augellargli bondi**", a quel su' **Rumoloremus**".

(Joyce 1938, 14. Translated by James Joyce and Nino Frank)

"Ed eccola là, Anna Livia, lei non **darentosa** lasciarsi andare a un **winkellino di sonno** e continua a scorrere come il **putto di [una] putta**, [Wendewandle, spess'un dito], in una gonna **lapponestiva** e guance **damazzonate per gurargli bonzur** al suo dolce e **dobroso Dan**".

(Joyce 1982, 95–97. Translated by Luigi Schenoni)

The first translation is Joyce's self-translation. Joyce, instead of only supervising the first translation into Italian and safeguarding the authority of the original (as he had done, for instance, with the team of French translators), rather creates a new text, free from the constraints posed by the translation process (Bollettieri 2009, 51). The result is a creative, target-oriented text (Bollettieri 2009, 52), in which heterology is translated with target-language heterology based on north-eastern regional linguistic variations (like "che non osonava pisolottare" and "bondi"), archaisms (like "gote" and "augellargli") and transpositions of original images into the Italian cultural context (like "Trento" and "Rumoloremus"), a strategy that drastically changes Anna Livia's voice.

The original heterology is more closely maintained by Schenoni in what is the first re-translation of "Anna Livia Plurabelle". In fact, Schenoni calques some of Joyce's word-play (such as "darentosa", "winkellino", "lapponestiva", "damazzonate" and "dobroso", from "darent", "winkle", "Lapsummer", "damazon" and "dubber"), while translating other elements by recreating and underlining musicality, as in "putto di una putta" for "chit of a child" and "per gurargli" for "for to ishim".

Furthermore, Schenoni systematically reacts to Joyce's target-oriented self-translation by introducing more source elements. His translation is more multi-voiced as it incorporates more of the original heterology, thus showing *both* the translator's and the author's voice. Finally it is less explicating, whereas Joyce had explicited various instances, such as "chit of a child", which becomes "bimbuccia", "damazon cheeks", which become "gote ardanti" (burning cheeks- an echo of Tasso's "gote ardenti" from *Il Rinaldo*.) and the French corruption "bonzour", which turns into the regional "bondi", while remaining intact in retranslation, even if spelled accordingly to Italian phonetic rules.

4.4 Multi-voicedness and heterology in third person narration

Our final example is taken from the short story “Clay” in *Dubliners*, where Maria’s voice is intertwined with that of the third person narrator, in what is a more classic occurrence of Kenner’s “Uncle Charles Principle”. The resulting multi-voicedness is characterized by several instances of heterology, like the expressions “spick and span” and “nice and bright”, the Irish “barmbracks” and the repetition of the adverb “very”, followed by plain adjectives like “big” and “small”. The combination of these elements creates the discourse, and therefore the implicit psychological portrait of a simple and naïve female character.

Excerpt 4

“[...] Maria **looked forward** to her **evening out**. The kitchen was **spick and span** [...]. **The fire was nice and bright** and on one of the side-tables were four **very big barmbracks**. [...]. Maria was a **very, very small person** indeed, but she had a **very long** nose and a **very long** chin.” (Joyce 1996, 110)

“Maria **guardava ansiosa** a quella sua **serata di vacanza**. La cucina era **linda e pinta** [...] **Ardeva un bel fuoco** e su una delle tavole laterali c’erano quattro **enormi focacce** [...] Una **donnina piccola piccola** Maria con un naso **lungo lungo**, però, e un mento **che non gli era da meno**.” (Joyce 1949, 98-99. Translated by Franca Cancogni)

“Maria **pensava con gioia** alla sua **sera d’uscita**. La cucina era **lucida come uno specchio** [...]. C’era un **bel fuoco luminoso** e su uno dei tavolini di servizio c’erano quattro **grandissime focacce** [...] Maria era una **personcina davvero molto, molto piccola**, ma aveva un naso **molto lungo** e un mento **molto lungo**.” (Joyce 1974, 1430–1435. Translated by Marina Emo Capodilista)

In Cancogni’s early translation, we can observe a loss of multi-voicedness caused by the choice of avoiding repetition (of the last “long”, for example, translated with “che non gli era da meno”, meaning that was not less) and of elevating the register (“ardeva un bel fuoco”, a nice fire was burning, for “the fire was nice and bright” and “enormi”, enormous, instead of “very big”).

Furthermore, Cancogni opts for doubling up adjectives instead of proposing a direct translation of the adverb-adjective combination persistently presented in the source

text, turning for instance “very, very small” into “piccola, piccola” (small, small), which, however, could be considered as multi-voiced, partly compensating for the losses mentioned before.

Emo Capodilista, on the other hand, restores multi-voicedness through the repetition of the adverb (very) in “molto molto piccola”, “molto lungo” and a second “molto lungo” and the use of more colloquial and low register idiomatic expressions, such as “lucida come uno specchio” instead of Cancogni’s more obsolete and refined expression “linda e pinta” for “spick and span”. Emo Capodilista’s retranslation is indeed more *and-source-and-target* oriented, as Cancogni’s voice is both incorporated through the use of “focaccia” and, at the same time, rejected by Emo Capodilista, through the many rectifications she makes, such as the correction of “guardava ansiosa” (was looking anxiously) for “looked forward”, and “serata di vacanza” (holiday evening) for “evening out”; more multi-voiced (as it incorporates more heterology, thus showing *both* the translator’s and the author’s voice); and finally less explicitating, as Cancogni, as opposed to Emo Capodilista, explicitates “person” into “donna” (petite woman).

Going beyond these examples and looking at even more recent retranslations, like Terrinoni’s retranslation of Molly’s monologue (Joyce 2012, 702–741), it becomes all the more apparent that the nexus of acceptability and adequacy in the Italian target system has unquestionably shifted through the years, when it comes to the characterization, through multi-voiced discourse, of Joyce’s female characters. If heterology in Joyce’s female voices was in fact mitigated in early translations, because certain expressions or thoughts were considered not socially acceptable, or even obscene, with the progression of new retranslations the use of explicit language by female characters becomes increasingly normalized. The following example shows how Molly’s idiolectic voice has evolved from the first Italian translation to the most recent one:

“[...] like that **slut** that Mary we had in Ontario terrace padding out her false **bottom** to excite him bad enough to get the smell of those painted women off him [...].” (Joyce 2010, 642 – Gilbert edition) / (Joyce 2008, 609, Gabler edition)

“[...] come quella **strega** quella Mary che avevamo a Ontario terrace che s’imbottiva il **sedere** per eccitarlo è già abbastanza sgradevole sentirgli addosso l’odore di quelle donnacce dipinte [...].” (Joyce 1960, 1841-1842. Translated by Giulio De Angelis)

“[...] come quella **sgualdrina** quella Mary che avevamo a Ontario Terrace che si imbottiva le **natiche** per eccitarlo e **già** abbastanza duro togli-

ergli di dosso **l** odore di quelle donnine dipinte [...].” (Joyce 1995, 570. Translated by Bona Flecchia)

“[...] come quella **puttana** quella Mary che avevamo a Ontario terrace col **culo** finto imbottito per farlo eccitare è già abbastanza che mi sorbisco gli odori di quelle donne truccate che **à** addosso [...].” (Joyce 2012, 703. Translated by Enrico Terrinoni)

“[...] come quella Mary **sozzona** che avevamo in Ontario Terrace che s’imbottiva il **culo** falso per eccitarlo già è brutto **sentigli** l’odore di quelle **vacche** pitturate [...].” (Joyce 2013, 1776. Translated by Gianni Celati)

“[...] come con quella **troia** della Mary che avevamo in Ontario Terrace e si imbottiva il **culo** falso per eccitarlo che già è abbastanza brutto sentirgli addosso **lodore** di quelle donne pitturate [...].” (Joyce 2020, 869. Translated by Mario Biondi)

As it can be seen from the Italian texts, Terrinoni, in 2012, was the first retranslator to opt for a more vulgar rendering of both “slut” and “bottom”, a strategy that was maintained by his successors, Celati (2013) and Biondi (2020). While at first sight it might seem, from a strictly semantic point of view, more ‘equivalent’ to translate e.g. “bottom” with “sedere” as in De Angelis’ initial rendering, one cannot forget that the term “bottom” had, to Joyce’s contemporaries, a pragmatic effect close to the effect that the vulgar “culo” has to the Italian reader today, whereas “sedere” is nowadays a neutral term. Also worth noticing is the fact that all Italian retranslators have found various solutions to compensate for Molly’s ungrammaticality (which is absent from the source text in this excerpt, but famously present throughout the monologue), as opposed to the first translator, whose version is devoid of all grammatical errors. The polemical attitude with regard to such standardization observed in all retranslations, yet also the way in which a retranslation such as Terrinoni’s can influence subsequent translations, is in line with the Re-dialogization Hypothesis.

5. Conclusion

Joyce’s female voices are conceived with the greatest attention to female psychology: vulnerability, duplicity, naivety, sarcasm, snobbishness, etc. are all traits perceivable while reading multi-voiced passages in the original, involving female voices. As the analyses illustrate, in first translations multi-voicedness tends to be flattened out as heterology tends to be mitigated and replaced with standardizations. Conversely, in retranslations, multi-voicedness tends to be more perceivable as heterology tends to

be rendered more systematically, through strategies that enable the reader to grasp each character's voice and personality. This would not be possible without the use of social-linguistic variation and idiolects.

While heterology tends to be reduced in first translations, it is more often maintained in retranslation. As a result, characters keep their idiolectic ways of expression and multi-voicedness becomes more perceivable in the latter. In turn, the presence of multi-voicedness in retranslation has an essential and perhaps even more important effect on the way in which female characters preserve their psychological traits. One of the most important observations is that when heterology is lost, multi-voicedness is often lost, and as a result, Joyce's way of characterizing female characters is lost or, at the very least, reframed into third-person narrational comments. Retranslations are essential to the psychological characterization of female voices: it is through retranslations and the more intense dialogical, source-through-target understanding they bring that Joyce's female voices can be restored to their original psychological richness.

All in all, it can be said that Peeters and Sanz Gallego's Re-dialogization Hypothesis (which, as mentioned before, is based on the analyses of Dutch and Spanish translations of *Ulysses*) appears to fit the Italian scenario as well, as early Italian translators tend to explicitate and standardize more, while retranslators tend to use more colloquialisms, to maintain repetition and to amend previous explicitations and misinterpretations.

By rendering the original heterology with contemporary heterology (and thus with terms and expressions having the same degree of colloquiality and/or vulgarity to today's Italian readership), retranslators like Terrinoni not only restore the original characterization of Joyce's female voices, but – and perhaps more importantly – bring these closer to what new generations of readers would perceive as being more genuine female characters. As we have tried to show, this is what it means to be more source-*through*-target-oriented, and why retranslation re-dialogizes the nexus of adequacy and acceptability, which, in the case of Joyce's female voices in Italian, had been monologized in the early translations.

References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1986. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bollettieri Bosinelli, Rosa Maria. 2009. "A proposito di *Anna Livia Plurabelle*." In *Anna Livia Plurabelle. Nella traduzione di Samuel Beckett e altri*, edited by Rosa Maria Bollettieri Holquist, Michael. 2002. *Dialogism*. London: Taylor & Francis.

- Joyce, James. (1938) 2009. "Anna Livia Plurabella." Translated by James Joyce and Nino Frank. In *Anna Livia Plurabelle. Nella traduzione di Samuel Beckett e altri*, edited by Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, 2–29. Milano: Ledizioni.
- Joyce, James. 1949. "Cenere." In *Gente di Dublino*. Translated by Franca Cancogni. Torino: Einaudi.
- Joyce, James. 1960. *Ulisse*. Translated by Giulio De Angelis. Milano: Mondadori.
- Joyce, James. 1974. "Cenere." In *Gente di Dublino*. Translated by Marina Emo Capodilista. Roma: Newton Compton.
- Joyce, James. (1982) 2009. "Anna Livia Plurabelle." Translated by Luigi Schenoni. In *Anna Livia Plurabelle. Nella traduzione di Samuel Beckett e altri*, edited by Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, 88–139. Milano: Ledizioni.
- Joyce, James. 1995. *Ulisse*. Translated by Bona Flecchia. Firenze: Shakespeare and Company.
- Joyce, James. 1996. "Clay." In *Dubliners*. London: Penguins Popular Classics.
- Joyce, James. 2008. *Ulysses*, edited by Walter Gabler. London: The Bodley Head.
- Joyce, James. 2010. *Ulysses*, edited by Stuart Gilbert. Ware: Wordsworth Classics.
- Joyce, James. 2012. *Ulisse*. Translated by Enrico Terrinoni and Carlo Bigazzi. Roma: Newton Compton.
- Joyce, James. 2013. *Ulisse*. Translated by Gianni Celati. Torino: Einaudi. [EPUB]
- Joyce, James. 2020. *Ulisse*. Translated by Mario Biondi. Milano: La nave di Teseo. [Kindle]
- Kenner, Hugh. 1978. *Joyce's voices*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Peeters, Kris. 2016. "Traduction, retraduction et dialogisme." *Meta* 61 (3): 629–49. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1039222ar>
- Peeters, Kris. 2021. "Retraduction, réaccentuation, redialogisation : stratégies éditoriales et stratégies de traduction dans les traductions néerlandaises des Liaisons dangereuses." *RELIEF ((Re)traduire les classiques français)* 15 (1): 10–26. <https://revue-relief.org/article/view/10828>
- Peeters, Kris, and Guillermo Sanz Gallego. 2020. "Translators' creativity in the Dutch and Spanish (re)translations of 'Oxen of the Sun' : (re)translation the Bakhtinian way." *European Joyce Studies* 30: 221–41. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004427419_013
- Peeters, Kris, Guillermo Sanz Gallego, and Monica Paulis. 2022 [in press]. "Dubliners retranslated: Re-accenting Multi-Voicedness." In *The Art of Translation in Light of Bakhtinian Re-accentuation.*, edited by Slav Gratchev. London/ New York/ Sydney/ New Delhi: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. 1984. *The Dialogical principle*. Translated by Wlad Godzich. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Toury, Gideon. 2012. *Descriptive translation studies - and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Van Poucke, Piet. 2020. "The effect of previous translations on retranslation", *Transcultural* 12 (1): 10–25. <https://doi.org/10.21992/tc29486>

About the author

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