

## CHAPTER II

### *Translation*

*Jolanta Wawrzycka*

‘Latin me that, my trinity scholar.’

(*FW* 215, 26)

When I first saw the entry ‘vulgar language’ in Clongowes Wood College’s Punishment Book, I was bemused by the offence and I remember thinking that, by forgoing the standard language, little Jim Joyce had just committed his first official act of intralingual translation. We cannot know what word(s) he used, though Father Bruce Bradley suggests that ‘it is possible to speculate about the vulgarity uttered by the seven-year-old James Joyce’ based on ‘Christopher Roche’s punishment earlier that year ... for calling a boy a vulgar name “stink”’<sup>1</sup>. Stephen thinks of Rody Kickam as a nice fellow but ‘nasty Roche was a stink’ (*P* 4); he grapples with ‘stink’ as he does with ‘suck,’ ‘kiss,’ ‘belt’ or God/Dieu. We see a novice translator unwittingly performing metempsychotic translations by considering, separately, words as the verbal ‘bodies’ in search of their ‘souls’ or meanings. Skeat in hand, young Joyce, auto-linguaged into college Stephen, wades through words ‘so familiar and so foreign’ (*P* 205), breaking away from the confines of English into the sophistication of multilinguisticity: ‘ivory, ivoire, avorio, ebur’ (*P* 193). When we first meet Bloom, he too performs a series of metempsychotic translations during his morning conversation with Molly in Calypso, a process he continues throughout the day. Linguaging, wording, punning and riddling are at the heart of Joyce’s artistic endeavour from the start when, as a novice poet of nine, he gave his first poem a Latin title ‘Et Tu, Healy’.

My task is to situate Joyce and his work in the context of translation – a tall order, considering Joyce’s own immersion in translation, his considerable investment in supervising and/or authorising translations of his own works and the issue of reception/translation of his œuvre throughout the world. The last area has been well covered recently in the two-volume *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe* (2004). The two other topics are amply covered under the umbrella of Joyce and ‘language’, with a host of studies

devoted to rhetorical, stylistic, linguistic and narrative considerations. Translation, yet another species of preoccupation with language, a deeply hypolectic one, to use Fritz Senn's term,<sup>2</sup> will serve in this chapter as a context for tracing Joyce's performative engagement with language(s) and for defining Joyce's translatorial, mediatory and inter-linguistic ethics of being-in-the-world – silence, exile, cunning and all. From the earliest translation exercises at school Joyce was learning to decode cryptograms of cultures and ideologies, scripts whose protean nature yielded the poly-idiomatic language of *Ulysses* and, eventually, 'the monstrous idiolect of *FW*'.<sup>3</sup> By writing *from* and *through* translation, and later *through* and *across* languages, Joyce cast English into relief, making his 'text' a site of competing idioms/idiolects and linguistic conventions/traditions, an apex of the modernist attitude that challenges the hegemony of national languages, cultures and ideologies. Thus the context of translation emerges as a crucial critical tool that positions Joyce at the crossroads of European literary and linguistic traditions embedded in wider contexts of cultures, religions, histories and political systems.

Joyce's relationship with translation falls into several categories: mandatory school translations; translatorial sorties into self-acquired languages (Dano-Norwegian and German); ambassadorial translations (of Hauptmann, Synge and Yeats); authorial self-translations; or collaborative translations of his own works. Then there is also the issue of 'language direction': into English from Latin or French or German; from English into Dano-Norwegian or Italian; and, in case of school translation exercises that were at the core of his early language training, both *into* and *from* English.

LATIN: 'THE MORROW THEE A KID SHALL BRING'  
HORACE/(JOYCE 1898 QUOTED IN JJ 50)

From Clongowes through his Belvedere and University years, Joyce, school-boy and student, had to demonstrate his Latin proficiency. Curran confirms both the breadth of learning that boys received as well as the immersion in Latin and 'Thomistic dicta'<sup>4</sup> that Joyce would later claim to forge Stephen's aesthetic theory. Indeed, the wider 'translation' context of Joyce's Jesuit education was delineated by Latin, from morning salutations, *Laudetur Jesus Christus*, to night benedictions, *Deo Gratias*<sup>5</sup> and daily classroom efforts dedicated *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*. In addition, there was Italian which Joyce began to study when he was nine (*L* 1132). His Belvedere language scores in Latin, French and Italian have been reproduced and widely discussed,<sup>6</sup> but it is worthwhile to emphasise the sheer breadth of his dynamic

immersion in inter-linguistic contexts. His Belvedere examinations called for translations from Ovid, Virgil, Cicero, Horace, Mme E. de Pressensé, Florian, Lamartine, Racine, Corneille, de Amicis, Tasso, Machiavelli, to name just a few.<sup>7</sup> The range expanded as Joyce entered the Royal University: examinations show that he had to translate from, among others, Dante, Molière, Voltaire, Hugo and George Sand.<sup>8</sup> We also recall the fun Joyce/Stephen and his friends had with mock Latin. And English, both the source and the target language of Joyce's translations, is more than just a 'silent' agent or a catalyst; it became a catch-all for the litter of linguistic residue that would morph, via *Ulysses*, into Wakeese.

In addition, the context of translation invites a look at Joyce's language engagement in terms of *process*, the *doing* of a translation, and, regardless of the outcome, what matters is the prolonged intellectual oscillation between two sets of linguistic and cultural parameters – a trans-relation – which allows for a re-forging of the foreign-language concepts in one's own mother tongue. I call this process *trans-semantification* or *re-linguaging*, in contrast to Jakobson's 'rewording',<sup>9</sup> in order to bring to focus the profound complexities of processes connoted by Übersetzen, transfere, traduit, tradurre, μεταφράζω, переводить, tłumaczyć, et cetera. Trans-semantification refers to the transference of a *literary work of art* into another language and denotes the complexity of *literary re-linguaging* which, in spite of replacing lexical surface of a literary work, manages to attend to sound, rhythm and semantic coloration of words, phrases and syntactical units of the original as it also takes cognisance of cultural references embedded in lexical structures (e.g. names, rhetorical formations, stylistic repetitions, colloquialisms or invectives) by scrupulously *re-fostering* them in the target language even – or particularly – at the risk of busting the normative boundaries of that language. Trans-semantification means that the very *literariness* of a literary work is carried across and re-created in another language.<sup>10</sup>

Joyce's early experiences with decoding and re-fostering meaning forged an acute linguistic consciousness and intuition. His June 1898 translation of Horace's Ode III, 13 (*JJ* 50–1), is assessed by Schork as a 'commendable exercise' and 'decent English verse',<sup>11</sup> while Sullivan praises this meritorious 'schoolboy exercise' as remarkable for the accuracy of expression, grace, accuracy, sense of language and faithfulness to the spirit of Horace.<sup>12</sup> This translation, Joyce's *earliest extant* piece of writing, is of great value for the glimpse it offers of young Joyce's 'exhibition of skill'<sup>13</sup> and linguistic introspection. It is through Latin that Joyce formulated his early aesthetics, quite likely resulting from the experiences of that Galvanic cardiac

condition, 'the enchantment of the heart', that accompanies the victory of wrenching out words/phrases from one language and rendering them felicitously in another.

As a young artist in search of style, Joyce, following Symons and Moore, also turned to French literature, translating Verlaine and Maeterlinck, most notably, Verlaine's 'Les sanglots longs'. The poem's actual title is 'Chanson d'automne', from the 1866 volume of *Poèmes saturniens* ('les sanglots longs' is the first line). Joyce rendered the second stanza of the poem with a fair degree of fidelity even if one misses Verlaine's word 'Monotone' (which, luckily, resurfaces in Joyce's Paris poem sent to Byrne and later published as song xxxv in *Chamber Music*). Stanzas one and three, however, though faithful in spirit, qualify as an 'interpretive translation', to use a Poundian term which will be discussed later in this essay. Verlaine's cadences inflected Joyce's, even if by 1902 Joyce would insist in a letter to Lady Gregory that 'there was no poetry in French literature' (*JJ* 115). Notably, it was though French that Joyce also tackled an ambitious writing project on Ibsen which carried him into new linguistic territories.

DANO-NORWEGIAN: 'THE MEDIUM OF HARDLY  
PROCURED TRANSLATIONS' (*SH* 32)

J. F. Byrne witnessed Joyce's 1899 self-tutoring sessions at the National Library where Joyce was 'cramming himself with the Norwegian language', working his way through 'a pile of books on Ibsen including some of his plays, a Norwegian dictionary and a Norwegian grammar', all a part of the process of preparing 'Ibsen's New Drama'.<sup>14</sup> Stephen, too, we remember, studied Danish walking along the canal with his 'Danish grammar' (*SH* 209). His new linguistic venture resulted in a moment of 'radiant simultaneity' (*SH* 33) when he 'encountered through the medium of hardly procured translations the spirit of Henrik Ibsen' and 'understood that spirit instantaneously' (*SH* 32). Kenner pointed out that Joyce, 'by reading [Ibsen] in the original could find a writer congenial to his own preoccupations with setting language significantly in action' and gain the kind of 'thematic immersion in language that defies translation',<sup>15</sup> an immersion which may well have fuelled Joyce's imperative to study Dano-Norwegian, especially since Ibsen's works were accessible in English. Joyce reciprocated Ibsen's message of appreciation of the April 1900 essay in *Fortnightly Review* eleven months later in his March 1901 letter to Ibsen in Dano-Norwegian, trusting that Ibsen would be able to 'decipher' his meaning (*L* 1 51). The sophistication of Joyce's letter is remarkable for the beginner (who, thirty-five years, later would actually speak 'good

Danish' (JJ 694)). As Ellmann aptly put it, 'Before Ibsen's letter Joyce was an Irishman; after it he was a European' (JJ 75).

SILESIAN GERMAN: 'ASTERISKS MARK WHERE THE TEXT HAS PROVED UNTRANSLATABLE' (JJA II 530)

Douglas Knight, in his discussion of the Augustan zeal for translation in the context of Pope's Homer, delineates a few *sine qua non* attributes of the translator: he should be an artist and a scholar-linguist, ready to 'range into areas of new insight' if he is to 'speak to his world' or open 'the door for another mind'; he has to be 'profoundly a member of his own world ... alive to the struggles and dilemmas of his culture, or his work will lack the urgency which good translation needs in order to compensate for the many kinds of loss which takes place between original and version'.<sup>16</sup> For the Augustans, translation served 'as a corrective to that provinciality of mind which would take as gospel anything an age seems satisfied with' and the validity of translation rested in its ability to provide 'the necessary foil for immediate experience'. Pope set out to translate Homer with 'a willingness to take the alien world seriously' and an ability to bring that world 'into living relation with all the accepted and unquestioned attitudes of his own world', which fostered 'the flowering of a poetic maturity not possible without both these earlier steps'.<sup>17</sup>

Knight's words serve well to illuminate the dynamics of young Joyce's immersion in translation. In summer of 1901, eleven years before Gerhart Hauptmann received the Nobel Prize, Joyce had translated his *Vor Sonnensufgang* as *Before Sunrise* (JJA II) and, apparently, *Michael Kramer* (L I 389), though that manuscript has vanished. Ellmann suggests that Joyce read Hauptmann in the original for the Ibsenian problem-themes and to improve his grasp of German (JJ 87-8), 'a language which until then he had disliked and avoided' (JJ 76). But the sheer labour on Joyce's part of 'transludning from the Otherman' (FW 419.24), of anchoring himself in Mullingar to produce an almost spotless manuscript penned in copperplate, points to more than just a language exercise. Kennerian 'thematic immersion in language' afforded Joyce access to concepts that indeed 'defied translation', and heightened his sense of the poet as 'the intense centre of the life of his age ... capable of absorbing in himself the life that surrounds him' (SH 67). Critics, like Robert Spoo, see Joyce's early critical writings as a means of inserting himself into the discourse of self, history, Romantic aesthetic theory;<sup>18</sup> Joyce's early translations could be seen in the same light, especially since in 1904 Joyce offered his Hauptmann translations to

W. B. Yeats for a possible staging by the Irish Literary Theatre. After Yeats' rejection (*L* II 58), the texts rested dormant until 1928 when Ezra Pound asked to see those 'juvenile indiscretions,' informing Joyce that 'the noble Gerhardt [*sic*]' was struggling with *Ulysses* in 'choimun'.<sup>19</sup> In 1937 Joyce arranged to have his translation of *Before Sunrise* autographed by Hauptmann and wanted to be introduced to him (*L* I 389). Right after Joyce's death there was an attempt to publish *Before Sunrise* to aid the Joyce family in Zurich. Joyce's representative in the US, Maria Jolas, was approached with the task and remarked that 'Joyce did very few translations and it reveals an *interesting facet of his mind* [my emphasis] that he should have done this one *at such an early age*.'<sup>20</sup>

At such an early age Joyce was already establishing a 'translation context' for his future works and, although he had never articulated any translating principles, a closer look at *Before Sunrise* reveals aspects of his *modus operandi*, including a humbling admission by the nineteen-year-old translator: 'asterisk mark where the text has proved untranslatable' (*JJA* II 530). Tymoczko observes that the distance between the source and the receiving culture greatly influences the 'impetus to simplify'.<sup>21</sup> The Hauptmann manuscript indicates three instances where Joyce simplified by excising passages (*JJA* II 464, 496 and 497). Not all omissions were caused by Joyce's difficulties with Hauptmann's Silesian dialect which he largely rendered in Anglo-Irish idiom; rather, as noted by Perkins, the omissions occur 'where there are suspension points in the dialogue' in standard German and where Joyce appears to have pared down Hauptmann's inherently elliptical and evasive dramatic language.<sup>22</sup> Joyce's translatorial errors, departures from the original syntactic arrangements, or reliance on paraphrase and ellipsis allow Perkins to highlight the value of the translation process as a whetting stone for Joyce's artistic maturation manifest in his handling of Hauptmann's dramatic idiom and in his eventual mastery of gnomic/elliptical diction.

But it is important to add that translation of a play usually presupposes stage production and, like performances, productions 'aspire to the status of versions' rather than definitive or normative units.<sup>23</sup> Rather than as a translation *sensu stricto*, Joyce's Hauptmann is best viewed as a version whose 'total constellation of visual and aural elements from out of which the words of the text' would emerge before an audience in the actual production. To translate a play means to recast it 'in the ways of a theatrical world for which it was never made', that is, 'from the language of one theatre to that of another' and entails 'linguistic transformation ... from virtual rewriting, through editing, cutting and the like, to dialectal substitutions and matters of handling allusions and references unfamiliar to

the audience'.<sup>24</sup> This process captures the essence of translation as a *literary performance* so central to the modernist experiment and so well anticipated in Joyce's translation of Hauptmann. Translation as a literary mode can engender a new work or medium, as Hollander illustrates in reference to Pound's translation of *Seafarer*: 'Going from one dialect of a language to another that is either historically or geographically or even sociologically removed ... there is always the temptation to try to blur the distinction between the two, to carve a new "dialect" out of the larger expanse of the inclusive language.'<sup>25</sup> Pound took the blurring and carving quite far when he defined the idea of 'interpretive translation' by stating that in 'cases where the 'translator' [*sic*] is definitely making a new poem, [translation] falls simply in the domain of the original writing.'<sup>26</sup> For Hollander, this 'heuristic kind of translation' functions 'more as a process of teaching than as a finished ... object'.<sup>27</sup> Undeniably, the translation process 'taught' Joyce plenty about writing: from honing his stylistic and syntactic skills to refining his extraordinary semantic/lexical intuition. That Joyce's writing, in turn, 'teaches' about its own textual production, and that readers translate Joyce's works as they read them, is by now one of the many cardinal reading principles formulated by Fritz Senn in his decades-spanning opus chiselled into *Dislocutions: Reading as Translation* and into *Inductive Scrutinies*. From such readerly concepts as *provective analysis*, *dynamics of dislocation* or *anagnostic reading*, Senn's brand of translatorial criticism demands from readers the same mental acuity and investment as does Joyce's brand of translational writing.

#### MAESTRO DI COLOR

Sustained critical studies of the 'Italian Joyce' have done much to reclaim the importance of Italy, of its language, literature and culture in Joyce's work. McCourt's portrait of 'Tarryeasty' contextualises Joyce's day-to-day life in a city where the dialect of *Triestino* absorbed not only other Italian dialects but also a plethora of European languages. This multilingual city was home to translators/interpreters working in 'araba, croato, czeca, ebraica, francese, greca, illirica, inglese, polacca, slovena, tedesca, ungharese',<sup>28</sup> while the families of Joyce's students frequently spoke four different languages. Trieste also boasted a newspaper called *Il Poliglotta*, which published articles in Italian, English, German, French and Spanish.<sup>29</sup> In this environment, Joyce's immersion in translatorial milieu was complete, in spite of his initially 'crippled Italian full of ulcers'<sup>30</sup> and 'covered with wounds and scabs'.<sup>31</sup> Italian also became the target language of Joyce's

ambitions as a translator: from his articles for *Il Piccolo della Sera* and his lecture at the Università Popolare, to translations of George Moore's *Celibates* (*JJA* I 534–90)<sup>32</sup> and of J. M. Synge's *Riders to the Sea* with Nicolò Vidacovich. In a 'genuine collaborative effort', Joyce and Vidacovich translated 'separate sections before combining their results and collectively completing their final version, Vidacovich offering his superior translating experience and his perfect Italian, Joyce drawing on his familiarity with Synge's Hiberno-English'. The resulting translation is 'remarkably true to the original' because it captures successfully 'Synge's difficult rhythms and sounds' and renders the flow of West-of-Ireland English as a simple and natural language without the use of any particular Italian dialect equivalent.<sup>33</sup> Lobner, however, registers the presence of 'Tuscan idioms and proverbial sayings' designed to render Synge's double-edged English idiom cast in Gaelic syntax.<sup>34</sup> Interestingly, the manuscript draft contains changes in spellings of the names presumably to aid stage pronunciation: 'Mauria' with a thicker 'ó' superimposed on the 'au', Mória, 'Bartley' overwritten by 'i' and 'á', Bártli, and 'Cathleen' altered to 'Cathlín' (*JJA* II). Generally, Joyce, unlike many purists, did not keep the original names in translation: he was fond of Italianising not only his own name but also the names of historical/literary figures in his articles and lectures. Thus we encounter Guglielmo Gladstone and Giovanni Mitchell (*JJA* I 680), or Oliviero Cromwell and Gualtiero Lynch (*JJA* I 692). And whereas Joyce convinced the Italian Grand Guignol Company to produce the play in 1909 (*L* I 67), it flopped because, according to one reviewer, its brevity, speed of action and its grotesqueness did not allow the Italian audiences 'to argue, to reflect, to think'.<sup>35</sup> Joyce was wiser three years later when he wrote to seek Yeats' consent to *publish* rather than produce *The Countess Cathleen* in his and Vidacovich's translation (*L* I 71). Judging from Joyce's letters, his ownership in the translation is unclear (*L* II 298; *L* I 71; *L* I 99), though Carla Marengo refers to it as the Vidacovich–Joyce translation when noting 'the lyrical qualities of the first version' of Yeats' play.<sup>36</sup>

As early as in 1915, in Zurich, Joyce's own new play *Exiles* generated offers of translation into French and Russian (*L* I 85). In 1918, he briefed Miss Weaver on his plans to have *A Portrait* translated into both Danish (*L* I 116) and French (*L* I 120) and he was already at work to have his serialised *Ulysses* translated into Italian, as evidenced by his correspondence with Linati (*L* I 121, 132; *L* II 456) who later also translated *Exiles*. Joyce's well-documented and 'fierce desire for publicity'<sup>37</sup> was matched by his equally fierce desire to be translated which saw him brokering, overseeing and participating in the process.

‘... AVEC LA COLLABORATION DE L’AUTEUR’

If the existence of translations and self-translations published during Joyce’s lifetime – the German *Ulysses* in 1927, the French in 1929, *Anna Livia Plurabelle* in 1931 – could provisionally guide other translators as to what the author might or might not have found acceptable, Fritz Senn cautions that there is ‘no evidence that Joyce’s supervision entailed a careful examination of every word’.<sup>38</sup> Joyce’s correspondence, however, demonstrates aspects of his engagement, such as his laborious combing ‘word for word through the German translation for the 1<sup>st</sup> 100 pp. It is all right now. But it was a hard work.’<sup>39</sup> Joyce and Georg Goyert faced enormous time pressure from Rheinverlag and Joyce felt that, ‘as they announce the translation completely “revised by the author” they must allow me time or I shall be obliged to publish a disclaimer’.<sup>40</sup>

Joyce’s involvement with the French *Ulisse* was even more taxing since it included mediation between both the translators and the Beach–Monnier duo. The ‘curious history’ of the French translation culminated in what Joyce labelled the ‘Trianons Treaty’ (*L* III 173). In the end, all three translators were honoured on the *Ulisse* titlepage: ‘Traduit de l’anglaise par M. Auguste Morel assisté par M. Stuart Gilbert. Traduction entièrement revue par M. Valery Larbaud avec la collaboration de l’auteur.’ By December 1930, Joyce, with his ‘passion for extending other languages as he had extended English, was hard at work on the French version of *Anna Livia Plurabelle*’, convinced that ‘[t]here is nothing that cannot be translated’ (quoted in *JJ* 632). It is interesting to note the collaboration process:

while Joyce smoked in an armchair Léon read the English text, Soupault read the French, and Joyce ... would break into the antiphony to ask that the phrase be reconsidered. Joyce then explained the ambiguities he had intended, and he or one of his collaborators dug up an equivalent. Joyce’s great emphasis was upon *the flow of the line*, and he sometimes astonished them ... by *caring more for sound and rhythm than sense*. But one or the other would insist upon rigor of this kind, too’ (*JJ* 632–3; my emphasis)

Joyce’s youthful, programmatic proclamation of ‘silence’ – or, in this context, his tacit years of linguistic/translatorial apprenticeship; ‘exile’ – translatorial life in Pola, Trieste, Rome, Zurich and Paris; and ‘cunning’ – the synthesis of all languages via *poly-* and *meta* language of the *Wake*, also seem remarkably to describe the stages of his translatorial existence. Cunningly, too, the *Wake* comes close to rendering translation superfluous, for one would have to decide which ‘language’ to translate from, as I remember Fritz Senn remark in 1986. For Umberto Eco, it is pointless to translate the *Wake* because

'it is already translated'. Eco's close analyses of Joyce's French and Italian 'Finnegian' illustrate Joyce's unprecedented push for languages to express the hereto *un*-expressible.<sup>41</sup> And if readers of the *Wake* can afford to be sweepingly 'panoramic scholars', translators are in the minority of 'thwarted mini-glossers'<sup>42</sup> as they join Joyce in creating parallel poly- and metalanguages. We have it on David Pierce's authority that the Dutch bilingual edition of the *Wake* adapts 'the Dutch language to the language of the *Wake* rather than the other way round'.<sup>43</sup> As translation studies grapple with 'problems' of 'translating' the *Wake*, Joyce is having the last laugh after all: we are busy explicating his works – one hundred years and counting – and we have yet adequately to situate *Finnegans Wake* in the context of translation.

*Coda: the psycho-politics of translation*

Modernists were intensely concerned with translation, convinced that 'the establishment of personal and cultural identity requires engaging with the multiple Others of foreign languages and traditions'.<sup>44</sup> As a result of multiple textual/linguistic practices, translation partakes of historicity by incorporating ontological and deeply political questions about who does the translating, why and when. For Vicki Mahaffey, Joyce's fierce focus on 'the local' is not unlike Yeats' conflation of national experience into the local one. Both Yeats and Joyce 'trained their microscopes' on the 'individual moment – in life and in language' as they both 'honoured the precision of their words and the art of their arrangement making it imperative for their readers, too, to exercise precise local control in their reading'.<sup>45</sup> In response to a long history of oppression, Irish writers developed experimental writing where wordplay acquires political dimensions and 'emerges as a local, germicidal version of a larger, more overtly political iconoclasm'.<sup>46</sup> In the guise of wordplay and riddling, meaning proliferates and subverts the symbolic authority of language as law. To riddle, Mahaffey reminds us, is also to explain, to fill with holes, to puncture, to corrupt: 'If we riddle a container, it will spring leaks', releasing the content of such representations of containment as 'imperialism, patriarchy and highly conventional art forms'.<sup>47</sup> Acts of translation, thus, become encounters with riddling, with a multitude of proliferating lexical/semantic choices, with writing both *through* and *outside* an acquired language whose authority is inevitably shattered. If acts of translation enabled Joyce to transcend the hegemony of English, they also plunged him into a deeply intimate psycho-relationship with it, for one can hardly imagine a more hypolectic involvement with language than translation. Like Joyce's foreign language word-lists or his

Paris, Pola and Trieste notebooks, translations became vehicles of transference of the 'private' and 'local' into the 'political,' as they infused the agency of his English, 'traduced into jinglish', (*FW* 275 F6), with poly- and metalingual dimensions of self-referentiality, bursting and rippling and riddling *ad infinitum*.

## NOTES

1. Bruce Bradley, SJ, *James Joyce's Schooldays* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1982), p. 152 n. 95.
2. Fritz Senn, *Inductive Scrutinies*, ed. Christine O'Neill (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1995), p. 228.
3. Jean-Michel Rabaté, *James Joyce, Authorized Reader* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), p. 117.
4. C. P. Curran, *Under the Receding Wave* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1970), pp. 39, 80. See also Fran O'Rourke's essay in this volume.
5. *Ibid.*
6. See exam results for 1894–8 in Bradley, *James Joyce's Schooldays*, pp. 110–11, 116–17, 130–1, 140–1.
7. Full lists can be found in Eileen MacCarvill, 'The Collection of Examination Papers and University Calendars', Zurich James Joyce Foundation 1992.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 256–347.
9. Roman Jakobson, 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', in Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, eds., *Theories of Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 145.
10. Jolanta Wawrzycka, "'Tell Us in Plain Words": Textual Implications of Re-Languaging Joyce', *Joyce Studies in Italy* 10 (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2007): 34.
11. R. J. Schork, *Latin and Roman Culture in Joyce* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1997), p. 144.
12. Kevin Sullivan, *Joyce among the Jesuits* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), pp. 75–6.
13. *Ibid.*, 76.
14. J. F. Byrne, *Silent Years: An Autobiography with Memoirs of James Joyce and our Ireland* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Young, 1953), pp. 58, 62.
15. Hugh Kenner, 'Joyce and Ibsen's Naturalism', *The Sewanee Review* 59 (Winter 1951): 78.
16. Douglas Knight, 'Translation: The Augustan Mode', in Reuben A. Brower, ed., *On Translation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 197.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 200–1.
18. Robert Spoo, *James Joyce and the Language of History: Dedalus's Nightmare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 58–60.
19. *PJ* 235.
20. Quoted in Jill Perkins, *Joyce and Hauptmann* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1978), p. 13.

21. Maria Tymoczko, 'Post-Colonial Writing and Literary Translation', in Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, eds., *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 23–4.
22. Perkins, *Joyce and Hauptmann*, pp. 29–30.
23. John Hollander, 'Versions, Interpretations, Performances', in Brower, ed., *On Translation*, p. 226.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 226–7.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
26. Read, ed., *Pound/Joyce*, p. 200.
27. Hollander, 'Versions, Interpretations, Performances', p. 213.
28. John McCourt, *The Years of Bloom: James Joyce in Trieste, 1904–1920* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 2000) p. 51 and n. 4.
29. *Ibid.*
30. Alessandro Francini Bruni, 'Joyce Stripped Naked in the Piazza', in Willard Potts, ed., *Portraits of the Artist in Exile: Recollections of James Joyce by Europeans* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1979), p. 12.
31. Silvio Benco, 'James Joyce in Trieste', *The Bookman; a Review of Books and Life* (1895–1933), 72, 4 (New York, Dec. 1930): 376.
32. See Serenella Zanotti, 'An Italianate Irishman: Joyce and the Languages of Trieste', *JJQ* 38.3–4 (2001): 411–30.
33. McCourt, *The Years of Bloom*, pp. 134–5.
34. Corinna del Greco Lobner, *James Joyce's Italian Connection: The Poetics of the Word* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1989), p. 10.
35. Quoted in McCourt, *Years of Bloom*, p. 136.
36. Carla Marengo Vaglio, 'Yeats' *The Countess Cathleen*: Vidacovich and Joyce's Translation', in *Joyce Studies in Italy* 2 (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 1988): 198–9.
37. Eric Bulson, 'Joyce Reception in Trieste: The Shade of Joyce', in Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo, eds., *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*, 2 vols. (London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004), II, p. 312.
38. Fritz Senn, *Joyce's Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation*, ed. J. P. Riquelme (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), p. 3.
39. Melissa Banta and Oscar A. Silverman, eds., *James Joyce Letters to Sylvia Beach, 1921–1940* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), p. 70.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Umberto Eco, *Experiences in Translation*, trans. Alistair McEwen (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), pp. 108–11.
42. Senn, *Inductive Scrutinies*, p. 232.
43. David Pierce, *Joyce and Company*. (London: Continuum, 2006), p. 112.
44. Steven Yao, *Translation and the Languages of Modernism* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p. 194.
45. Vicki Mahaffey, *States of Desire: Wilde, Yeats, Joyce, and the Irish Experiment* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. ix–x.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 5.